LIBRARY,
OF INDIANA.
FEB 8 1901

Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXIII. BOSTON, FEBRUARY, 1901. No. 2.

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR. TEN CENTS PER COPY.
Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Matter.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIALS ..... PAGE 25-26
Queen Victoria's Death — The Commemorative Meetings.

ADDRESSES AT THE COMMEMORATIVE MEETINGS 26-44
The World's Marseillaise. *Poem, Joseph Cook* — Progress of Arbitration the Past Century. *Robert Treat Paine* — The Permanent Court of Arbitration. *Edward Everett Hale, D. D.* — Obligation of Women to Promote Peace. *Mary A. Livermore* — The Real Sign of Promise. *William Lloyd Garrison* — The Present Position of the Peace Movement. *Benjamin F. Trueblood* — Hindrances to International Peace. *Herbert Welsh* — Christian Endeavor's War Against War. *John Willis Baer* — The Absurdities of Militarism. *Ernest H. Crosby* — The Commercial Aspects of War. *Edward Atkinson.*

Queen Victoria's Death.

Because of her long reign, her pure and noble womanhood, her power for righteousness in English and general public life, the wonderful progress of the world during her lifetime, and her influence for peace among the nations, Queen Victoria's death has made an impression upon the world such as that of no other sovereign ever produced, or is likely soon to produce. She had come to seem an essential part of our civilization. Her departure has made a vacant place which the people of all lands are saddened to see. The foreign mourning over her death is no formal diplomatic sniffling.

Whatever the faults of the English government, however sharp the censure directed against certain British policies, the great womanly Queen seems somehow to have nearly entirely escaped personal criticism, and besides to have won and retained to the last the love of the people of all lands, even of her country's severest critics. Of what other sovereign of our time, at any rate of a great power, could anything similar be said? She was to the world the personal embodiment of the best English religious, social and political ideals. Though she is considered to have had great personal influence in the government, yet she escaped in a most remarkable way the fate which overtakes so many rulers, that of being reckoned foremost among the number of those who plunge a country into mad and ruinous schemes. This is a fact almost unique in the history of sovereigns. The lesson of her life, influence and world-popularity may well be taken seriously to heart by the English people and political leaders at the present momentous time.

Next to the word goodness, one naturally associates the word peace with the late Queen. Real goodness always leads to the love of peace. Victoria began her royal career with the wish to be good; she closed it with a passionate longing for the permanent peace of Europe and of the world. Years ago she let it be known in court circles that she would never sign another declaration of war. Scheming British politicians knew this, and managed their aggressions so that war always seemed to be forced upon Great Britain.

The Queen became more and more troubled in her later years on account of the petty wars of greed and conquest in which her government was incessantly engaged. There were about eighty of these during her reign, for some of which she no doubt had in her way her share of responsibility.

It was an open secret that the South African war greatly distressed her. She made an effort to go "with the tide" of the country in support of it, and this is about the only thing for which she has been severely criticised by certain classes of people. But her heart was not in it. It gave her grief too intense to be put away. This grief ate her life out. If her death was not actually hastened by this cause, as is generally believed, her last months were heavily clouded and embittered by it. Her grief and suffering over the war are a powerful tribute to the goodness and greatness of her soul. Imagine certain of the members of the present British cabinet or of the London press suffering unto death over the plight into which the nation has fallen! But the sacrifice of one so noble as the late Queen is at the same time the royal seal of England's sin and shame in the South African business.

The question has been much discussed, what influence the Queen's death is likely to have in European politics. Little but guessing is here possible; so much depends upon the character and aims of her successor, and upon the spirit and conduct of the English people. In some parts of Europe it is believed that the accession of Edward VII. will actually strengthen the foundations of peace. We hope so. He has a great opportunity before him — such as no king ever had before — if he only knows how to use it. If he would only throw the whole weight of the throne to bring England back from her present lapse into barbarism, a fame even greater than that of his royal mother would be assured him.

While Victoria lived, she was universally recognized as a powerful factor in the preservation of peace. Some have gone so far as to aver that foreign love and respect for her alone prevented an open rupture of the European powers with England. This is great praise. What is certain is that the desire for peace deepened with her to the last. The scene at her bedside, when in her last lucid moments she called the Prince of Wales and the Emperor of Germany to her and they pledged each other on their knees to do all in their power to keep perpetual peace between England and Germany, and elsewhere throughout the world, is a striking revelation of the desire uppermost in her soul,—a revelation also of the anxiety with which she went to her grave, at thought of the calamities threatening Europe from the present mad rivalry of armaments and greed of expansion.

We hope the cable has not lied about this deathbed occurrence. But if it be true, and Edward VII. and William II. were sincere in the pledges made to the dying Queen, they will soon discover that it takes something more than pious wishes to preserve and perpetuate peace. There is no peace along the lines of present European politics. The only way in which these heads of two great powers can practically keep their pledges is by throwing the force of their powerful kingly positions forevermore hereafter squarely against the further development of the armies and navies of their countries, and against the whole jingoistic, imperialistic spirit which is brewing war in many quarters of the globe. Otherwise they will find that, while they are bowing their heads, crossing their hands upon their breasts, and solemnly saying, "Yes, dear mother! yes, beloved grandmother! we will keep the peace of the world which you have sacredly entrusted to us," they themselves are among the chief agencies in turning the solemn ceremony at the lamented Queen's bedside into a hollow mockery and hastening the terrible disasters which they have vowed to try to avert.

The Commemorative Meetings.

The meetings announced in our last issue, in commemoration of the progress of the cause of international peace during the nineteenth century, were held in Tremont Temple, Boston, on the 16th of January. Owing to inclement weather, the prevalence of the grip, and other causes, the audiences were not as large as we had hoped they would be; but they were made up of representative people and were unusually full of interest and enthusiasm. The speaking was of a high order, honest, direct, and some of it extremely telling in its characterization of the absurdities of present-day militarism.

The meetings proved to be much more than merely commemorative gatherings. Gratulations were freely indulged in because of the remarkable progress which the past century had to show, and the hope, therefore, to be entertained for the future. But a number of the speakers dwelt expressly on what ought still to be done; on the false and absurd notions about war still prevailing; on the ugly obstacles in the way of further advance, and the absurdity and grotesqueness of the situation in which the civilized nations find themselves to-day by reason of their selfishness and folly in keeping up great armaments.

We wish we could put into the report of the meetings the tone of hopefulness and courage and the coloring of intense interest and enthusiasm which prevailed in them. This we cannot do, except in small measure. But we give our readers what we hope will prove a rare treat to them, the privilege of reading in full all of the addresses which were made. Their contents furnish ample ground for the largest hope for the future, at the same time that they lay bare the numerous and stubborn difficulties in the way of the final triumph of international peace, whose removal will tax the wisdom and strength of the friends of the cause for many years to come.

Report of the Addresses Delivered at the Commemorative Meetings Held in Tremont Temple, Boston, January 16th.

The World's Marseillaise.

BY JOSEPH COOK.

Sent by Dr. Cook for the Tremont Temple Peace Meetings.

Now girt with lightnings, docile, fleet,
There stands an angel, with his feet
The one on sea and one on shore;
And Time henceforth shall be no more.

All men are men and men are one,
Join hands all zones beneath the sun,
White, bronze and black and brown and red,
All climate's tintings myriad.

Like rainbow colors, all are kin,
One God above, one law within;
Man's sky with colors seven may glow,
But colors seven make heaven's bow.

Now drumbeats call, from God's vast sky,
Earth's listening heart to Loyalty;
And now no land can foreign be,
And now at last there is no sea.

One sun is in our single sky,
And underneath one family;
On earth so huge and yet so small,
Are all for each and each for all.

Let God's Great Order through men run,
So pray the stars and moon and sun;
Amen, we answer, every one;
God's will in us be wholly done.

Progress of Arbitration the Past Century.

BY ROBERT TREAT PAINE.

Friends of Peace, Justice and the World's Best Progress: We meet to do all in our power to start the new century right, in the pursuit of these great ideals. We meet to review the progress which the last century has achieved in this direction; and as we realize how glorious this progress has been, we will thank God and take courage. We shall find in the rapidly increasing speed with which the civilized world has been moving toward these great ideals not only profoundest cause for hope even now, in spite of temporary eclipse; but as we see how this progress has been made under the compulsion of the intelligent conscience of the civilized world, friends of peace in America and in all lands may approach the threatenings of war, as they will no doubt arise for many years to come, with exultant faith and indomitable courage.

Science teaches how the natural world advances by evolution, so that whoever doubts is an effete remnant of exploded ignorance. With equal certitude, the history of this last good old nineteenth century declares the wondrous progress of the world towards peace among the nations, towards judicial arbitration aiming at justice, as a substitute for the cruel decisions of bloody war, aiming at greedy conquest or ghastly revenge.

We salute the new twentieth century with all its radiant hopes of even more rapid progress. We consecrate to this cause the full measure of the strength God has given to us. We firmly believe our glorious republic will lead the vanguard of civilization, and that the powers of Europe will not be far behind.

Glance rapidly over the last century and see how it more than confirms what I have said. A hundred years ago, after our country had achieved its independence by force of arms in a long war, the French Revolution filled the sky of the civilized world with its bloody horrors, its function being to destroy the last remnants of feudalistic tyranny. Waterloo buried the old and marked the beginning of the new conditions of life. Who can imagine the contempt of Napoleon for arbitration as a substitute for his old guard and his brilliant array of marshals!

What a crushing rejoinder to war fiends is made by the progress of international arbitration in this century just closed! Unheard of during the first decade, it culminates in the last decade in the Hague Conference and Convention, with a Permanent High Court of Nations. The Czar's immortal invitation, at first "criticised with sneers, abuse, ridicule or indifference, mostly by people who have taken the precaution not to read it," will take rank as one of the great documents in all history, with the Magna Charta of Runnymede and the Declaration of Independence. Hear again its opening words: "The maintenance of general peace and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations present themselves, in the existing condition of the whole world, as the ideal towards which the endeavors of all governments should be directed."

Now hear its close: "This Conference would be, by the help of God, a happy presage for the century which is about to open. It would converge in one powerful focus the efforts of all the states which are sincerely seeking to make the great conception of universal peace triumph over the elements of trouble and discord. It would, at the same time, cement their agreement by a corporate consecration of the principles of equity and right, on which rest the security of states and the welfare of peoples."

What grander theme can some great future historian find, when he treats of the World Drama, than the gathering at The Hague of a hundred leading men of the twenty-six great nations of the world and the conflict of intellectual forces among them — at first with skepticism of any serious action as to arbitration, and then how the men from America were in dead earnest; and how later, when things looked dark, letters poured in from all parts of the United States with hopes and prayers, till at last the whole Conference was led to its splendid triumph and the High Court of Nations was set up before the world, the most august tribunal in all history.

Hear again a few of the opening words of this great agreement:

"Animated by a strong desire to concert for the maintenance of general peace;

"Resolved to promote by their best efforts the friendly settlement of international disputes;

"Recognizing the solidarity which unites the members of the society of civilized nations;

"Desirous of extending the empire of law, and of strengthening the appreciation of international justice;

"Convinced that the permanent institution of a Court of Arbitration, accessible to all, in the midst of the independent powers, will contribute effectively to this result;

"Having regard to the advantages attending the general and regular organization of arbitral procedure;

"Sharing the opinion of the august initiator of the International Peace Conference that it is expedient to solemnly establish, by an international agreement, the principles of equity and right on which repose the security of states and the welfare of peoples;

"Being desirous of concluding a convention to this effect, have appointed as their plenipotentiaries: . . ."

Listen to the Articles creating the High Court:

"Chapter 11. On the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

"Article 20. With the object of facilitating an immediate recourse to arbitration for international differences which could not be settled by diplomatic methods, the signatory powers undertake to organize a Permanent Court of Arbitration accessible at all times, and acting, unless otherwise stipulated by the parties, in accordance with the rules of procedure included in the present Convention.

"Article 21. The Permanent Court shall have jurisdiction of all cases of arbitration, unless there shall be an agreement between the parties for the establishment of a special tribunal."

The eminence of the members of this Court now being appointed by the nations guarantees its dignity. The achievement of this High Court of Arbitration is numbered among the noblest of the century, a consummation not dreamed of a decade ago. Even in 1898, when the Czar made his proposals to the world, they were received with such incredulity or ridicule that his sincerity was much discussed, whereas now it is conceded by all to be the supreme glory of his reign.

Americans should not forget that the most picturesque incident of the Hague gathering was the oration, on the Fourth of July, of our honored delegate, Andrew D. White, on the "Fame and Memory of the Great Dutch Jurist, Hugo Grotius," with the ceremony of depositing

a beautiful silver wreath upon his tomb in the presence of them all.

How can any century of coming time equal this transcendent stride towards international peace and justice, from the bloody struggle of Waterloo to this peaceful triumph at The Hague? Will you turn back with me and think of some of the stages of this wondrous progress?

Dr. W. Evans Darby, secretary of the Peace Society of England (International Tribunals, p. 486), has gathered into a noble progression the data of one hundred and ninety-five "Instances of International Arbitration since the Pacification of 1815."

The first arbitration of the century, so far as I know, was between the United States and Great Britain, by the treaty of Ghent in 1814, about matters in the Bay of Fundy. While the first decade of the century saw none and the third saw only four, the last decade saw sixty-three cases of peaceful arbitration.

Whether Europe or America will ever witness again a vast struggle between great civilized powers, we cannot know. If not impossible, it is at least utterly improbable in the judgment of eminent and wise students of this subject (of whom perhaps the foremost in the world is the public-spirited publicist, Mr. J. S. Bloch, a banker of vast wealth at Warsaw), so terrific have grown the powers of annihilating life and of inflicting commercial and financial ruin on the world, perhaps on victor almost as much as on the vanquished. (The Future of War. J. S. Bloch, 1899.)

Yet it is painful to remember that since Waterloo at least six wars of the first magnitude have brought sudden eclipse over the world. The Crimea, Italy, Turkey, Austria, France and our own land have seen and suffered. May I relate an incident to show how suddenly volcanic explosions come? When I attempted the ascent of Mt. Blanc in July, 1870, peace reigned, but as I descended the next day into Chamounix a gens d'armes tapped one of my guides on the shoulder with the order to report for duty, as war had been declared.

The movement for an arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the United States I think we may say began in 1887, when a deputation of thirteen Englishmen brought over a memorial signed by two hundred and thirty-three members of the British House of Commons, presented it to the President, and were received by him most cordially. Let me read a few words. The memorial asked for "a treaty which shall stipulate that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments, which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency, shall be referred to arbitration. Should such a proposal happily emanate from the Congress of the United States, our best influence shall be used to ensure its acceptance by the government of Great Britain." The President promised to give the matter his "faithful and careful consideration."

The next important step was taken on the 3d of April, 1890, when the Sherman Concurrent Resolution was passed unanimously by our House of Representatives — a brief but important resolve:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) that the President be and is hereby requested to invite from time to time, as fit occasion may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the governments, which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency, may be referred to arbitration."

Now you will remember that just at that time the Pan-American Congress had been meeting at Washington, summoned by our government from all the republics of this continent. Let me read a few words spoken when that conference was called together, in the welcome officially extended by Mr. Blaine on the 3d of October, 1889, to the delegates from the countries of this continent:

"The delegates I am addressing can do much to establish permanent relations of confidence, respect, and friendship between the nations which they represent. They can show to the world an honorable, peaceful conference of eighteen independent American powers, in which all shall meet together on terms of absolute equality; a conference in which there can be no attempt to coerce a single delegate against his own conception of the interests of his nation; a conference which will permit no secret understanding on any subject, but will frankly publish to the world all its conclusions; a conference which will tolerate no spirit of conquest, but will aim to cultivate an American sympathy, as broad as both continents; a conference which will form no selfish alliance against the older nations from which we are proud to claim inheritance; a conference, in fine, which will seek nothing, propose nothing, endure nothing, that is not, in the general sense of all the delegates, timely and wise and peaceful."

And a few words toward the end of Mr. Blaine's welcome:

"It will be a great gain when we shall be able to draw the people of all American nations into closer acquaintance with each other,— an end to be facilitated by more frequent and more rapid intercommunication. It will be the greatest gain when the personal and commercial relations of the American States, South and North, shall be so developed and so regulated that each shall acquire the highest possible advantage from the enlightened and enlarged intercourse of all."

You will remember that, as a result of that Pan-American Congress, a brief draft of a treaty of arbitration was prepared, to be signed by the delegates of those countries. It was signed by all of them. Unfortunately it had a time limit, which required that it be ratified by the home governments on or before a given date, which came too soon, so that no accomplished treaty has grown out of that proposal.

Immediately after the adjournment of the Pan-American Conference, and acting upon the resolve passed unanimously by our House of Representatives, a circular letter from our State Department, over the signature of Mr. Blaine, was sent to the various countries with whom we have diplomatic relations, intimating that the United States was ready to negotiate treaties of arbitration. This then was another important step forward in 1890.

I happened to be in Paris in September, 1891, and inquired of Mr. Whitelaw Reid, our ambassador there, what progress had been made in the matter with France. He said that France was not ready to negotiate treaties of arbitration. France felt that she had a matter to settle with Germany, to recover Alsace and Lorraine, which meant war, and she was not ready seriously to consider arbitration. In London Mr. Robert T. Lincoln, our ambassador at the Court of St. James, told me he had communicated the letter of our State Department to the British government. It had been acknowledged, but nothing further had been done, and at that time he was not hopeful that Great Britain would act.

Large bodies move slowly; England did not act until after a lapse of over a year, when the friends of peace

in the House of Commons made a strenuous attempt. The 16th of June, 1893, was a great day in our cause. Mr. Gladstone, prime minister, improved the resolution introduced by Mr. Cremer by an amendment which he himself offered. After a debate, in which he made a powerful speech (Sir John Lubbock and other leading members speaking, and a good part of the session being devoted to speeches in favor of the motion), this resolution was passed "without a division":

"That this House has learned with satisfaction that both Houses of the United States Congress have authorized the President to invite from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments, which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agencies, may be referred to arbitration, and peaceably adjusted by such means; and that this House, cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, expresses the hope that Her Majesty's government will lend their ready coöperation to the government of the United States upon the basis of the foregoing resolutions."

The dangers growing out of the dispute between America and England about the Venezuelan boundary presently directed the thoughts of both nations towards a permanent treaty between them providing for obligatory arbitration. Such a treaty was prepared, as all know. The failure of this treaty to be ratified in the United States Senate for lack of a few votes is still a matter of profoundest regret to all friends of peace in both lands.

All this brings us to the next great step forward demanded in the interests of peace between the Anglo-Saxon peoples. Is not the time ripe for the negotiation and ratification of a new treaty on similar lines to those which Mr. Olney and Sir Julian Pauncefote developed? Italy and Argentina, three years ago, completed a treaty for permanent arbitration. Other nations of the world should follow. Why may it not be the privilege and the high honor of the United States to be among the leaders in the further advancement of this great cause?

Before I close, allusion must be made to the shame now overwhelming England and the United States for their attempts to crush out the liberties of the Boers and the Filipinos by cruel, protracted and, in the judgment of many competent judges, hopeless war. Whether, in the good providence of God, the jingoes of both lands are to triumph, the future will reveal.

Oh, that the United States government might realize the intensity of horror, humiliation, heart burning, felt by many of our people at the attempted oppression and subjugation of a people three times as numerous as we were in our struggle for liberty, under the pretence that we have bought them as prize of war, and are entitled to rule them because they need our benevolent aid and Christian civilization! "Benevolent assimilation" is discovered to mean the moral ruin of a simple, childlike, innocent people, of course not the equals of the Anglo-Saxons in mental power or civil development, but who know enough to fiercely resent being treated with contempt by dregs of soldiers who, in spite of good officers, usually call the Filipinos "damned niggers," and treat them accordingly.

The limitations of our Constitution, regarded as the consummate product for civil government in the world's history, are brought out prominently by the necessities of this distant and unnatural war. Should the President, in order to promote a settlement, exercise powers not conferred by the Constitution, such usurpation would make him a temporary autocrat to be compared to the dictator in ancient Rome, when clothed with supreme powers of protecting that republic in crises of great danger; but the thought is intolerable, and the usurper would be impeached.

Secondly, the methods of *Congressional action* are so slow and so controlled by party interest and strategy, that up to this moment, wonderful and shameful to relate, Congress has taken no action under which the Philippine war can be settled, short of that unconditional surrender, which to a foreign people, with the power, patriotism and intelligence of the Filipinos, is worse than annihilation.

Or, thirdly, is it the wish of America that discretionary powers should be conferred upon a *war cabinet?*

Alas, why should our Constitution, admirably adapted to promote the welfare of our own people in this vast continent of America, be degraded and polluted to meet the exigencies of needless foreign war? Such abandonment of our own heritage of infinite value would be the worst treason possible to contemplate.

No government can be well adapted to the peaceful and deliberate processes of a democratic republic and at the same time to the arbitrary autocratic methods of Czar or Kaiser or even British Cabinet. Either of these latter agencies would have escaped the Philippine war at the outset, could have settled it at any time in the struggle, or could make a satisfactory adjustment now within sixty days. But the methods of the American Constitution, admirably adapted to our own government, are an utter failure when the force of war and the arts of diplomacy should be in a single hand, able to act with prompt decision.

How soon would peace prevail between the Filipinos and us if we remembered the Golden Rule! Who dares to think what punishment God may have in store for America if she goes on warring upon them in the mad pursuit of commercial gain or power, or to acquire a convenient stepping-stone to Asiatic empire!

England also,— how can she be blind to the tremendous dangers of her crime against liberty and God? Is it possible she does not see how she is alienating that respect and affection for her throughout the United States, which, without any treaty, was bringing on a solidarity of the Anglo-Saxon peoples of infinite value to her welfare in possible struggles of the not remote future? How can she be conscious of strength and self-respect when her best citizens are crushed under a weight of shame? Sad indeed was it at the Peace Conference in October last, at Paris, to see an illustrious Englishman rise to speak, and say, with bowed head, that as an Englishman his hands were dripping with his brothers' blood.

Yet away with all despondency! God rules, and righteousness must prevail, at least at last. I wish every American might read the recent noble appeal of Cardinal Gibbons, head of the Roman Catholic Church in America, to America for justice to the Filipinos. Why will not ministers of God all across our land teach their people the duty of justice to other peoples by our mighty nation, as well as of justice between man and man? The advocates of peace appeal to them to aid

in arousing and guiding our people and all peoples, to forget greed of gain or lust of land or pride of power, and to hate all the wickedness of war, and to remember that the glory of a nation consists not in wealth, even though it be beyond the dreams of avarice, nor in swift and powerful and numerous ships of war, nor in the array of invincible armies, but in the exaltation of those qualities of mind and heart and will wherein man was made in the image of God.

The exact terms of settling these two wicked wars against Boers and Filipinos are not for our consideration; yet what friend of peace would not condemn the demand for unconditional surrender as a crime and a blunder? We demand of both Anglo-Saxon nations to treat their present foes with the magnanimity due from the powerful to the weak; from educated, cultivated, Christian nations to other peoples whom they propose to civilize and uplift.

Here, then, are some of the splendid ambitions of peace men at the present time:

Peace on magnanimous terms between America and the Filipinos.

Peace on magnanimous terms between Britain and the Boers.

The stout upholding of the High Court of Nations created by the Hague Convention.

Special treaties by each nation with each and every other nation, by which they shall be bound to submit all future disputes to the arbitration and decision of this High Court of Nations.

The Permanent Court of Arbitration.

BY EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D.D.

I have assigned to me the very pleasant duty of speaking on the history of the Hague Conference. It is a duty which would have been better discharged by our friend Dr. Trueblood, who was present at The Hague through the meetings of the Conference; but he has a wider field to speak of to-day, and I shall confine myself entirely to the subject which has so much interest now, the successful establishment of the High Court of Nations.

The ideal of a High Court is by no means new; it has been on the minds of people of conscience and intelligence since the time of Henry IV.; but nobody has known how to bring it about until the Czar of Russia, the head of the largest army which has ever been in the world, the head of the largest empire which now exists, proposed measures for the pacification of the world. I will not now go into any explanation of the sneers and cynical criticism with which the Czar was met; the success which has attended his proposals is so great that we can well forget the Pharisees and Sadducees and Philistines who steadily opposed the progress of the movement.

I am an American and I speak as an American. I am democrat of the democrats, and I speak as a democrat. I believe in constitutional law. And it is in each of these capacities that I ask you to congratulate the world on the success with which the new century begins. Speaking as an American, I like to say that I do not believe the High Court of Nations would exist to-day if the Supreme Court of the United States had not been called into being in 1789. I believe that that magnificent object-lesson has, in a hundred years, produced its effect upon the nations. If thirteen states of different origins, different religions, different selfishnesses, could ally themselves together into the United States, and that region become so large that cynics like to call it an empire, why, there must be some reason for this. The reason is, first, second and last, that these thirteen states agreed to refer every difficulty which might arise between them to what they proudly called the Supreme Court. It is not possible, I say, for such an object-lesson to exist for one hundred and ten years without carrying its lesson to the nations of Christendom.

If a Supreme Court succeeded with these thirteen states, till they grew to be forty and forty-five states, why should it not succeed with the twenty-six countries of Europe, Asia and America, represented at The Hague? The Emperor of Russia thought it would. I think it is fair to say that the same desire for peace existed also among the real statesmen of the world, the men who give their attention to the foundations of empire and to the principles of government. There are not a great many men who make this a study. Many persons offer opinions upon subjects of which they know nothing; but there are a few men in every nation who study the science of government and know something of it. They are not men who rush to the journals to blow their own trumpets, or whose trumpets are much blown by other people. They are such men as Grotius was,— a private individual, who has swayed the whole international thought and movement of nearly three centuries. The great writers on international law have all been private men, and international law exists to-day because private students have wrought it out. I venture to say that that class of men in the nations of the world believed in peace.

When the Czar's proposal was brought forward, the heads of the twenty-six powers of course selected such men as these as their representatives at The Hague. When it is said that the meeting of the hundred men at The Hague was the most remarkable body of men who ever came together in the history of modern times, the meaning is that this class of students were together there. Whatever any individual sovereign might think as to the possibilities of the conference, no one of them chose to be represented there by an inferior person.

America sent to this tribunal a very remarkable delegation. One likes to say this when he is told constantly that appointments in this country are made simply for pay; for somehow it has turned out, for a hundred and ten years, that the diplomacy of America has been marvelously successful in the diplomatic work of the world. We sent to The Hague a body of men who had the understanding that the government of this country meant to have a Permanent Tribunal of the nations, and that it believed that this could be brought about by the meeting of this body. When they waited upon the authorities in England, they found those gentlemen only eager to carry out such a plan. I do not think words can be found to express the sense of the gratitude that the world ought to show Lord Pauncefote for the steady way in which he insisted from the beginning that a High Court was possible; that that was the center of the target, at which all arrows should be directed. Now on that side of the ocean it is not the fashion to speak of America with contempt; we reserve that for ourselves. So from the beginning all men knew that it was the opinion of America that it would be wise and prudent to establish

such a tribunal, and indeed that it was the determination of England and America to have a High Court of Arbitration. All men knew that our people did not propose to discuss bullets, to pass useless statutes with regard to the size of armies; but that, first, second and last, they had come to make a High Court of Nations.

The Emperor Napoleon (whose name I am afraid to mention here) had a *mot* which I think had wisdom in it. He said, "If you set out to take Vienna, take Vienna." Do not be tempted to Berlin on the one hand or Milan on the other, to stop and sing oratorios or to raise potatoes, but take Vienna. The result of applying that rule in the case before us is that I can congratulate you that there is now a Permanent Tribunal, a High Court of the Nations.

Of course the Russian envoys were willing to fall in line. But when the delegates arrived at The Hague, nobody but England, America and Russia — though possibly Italy and France should be included — had any confidence in the possibilities. The greater part of the delegates thought the whole thing was a fiasco, that a few sounding resolutions would be passed and that everybody would go home again. They shook hands with each other with a gloomy feeling that they were being shelved, as we sometimes put a noisy politician into some post of honor to be rid of him. But soon they found this little knot of Englishmen and Americans who were saying all the time "High Court of Nations," "Permanent Tribunal." About a fortnight after the conference began there came a moment, really historic now, when the Austrian delegate waked up, came across to our headquarters to consult about it, and said that he was with them.

In an assembly like this, one is glad to say that there is reason to think that the steady pressure of exactly such meetings as this, held in America all through that period, was the power which, at the wavering moment of the conference, gave courage to our delegates and to those from England. I was told by one of our delegates that when one of the foreign statesmen asked, with a sort of sneer, "What do you know about the public opinion of your country?" he was able to say, "Know about it? If you could see the baskets full of mail that come to us every week from America you would know about it." He spoke to me with particular interest of some place in Oregon by the name of Cranberry Centre, or something of the sort, where a Baptist convention had met, and had subscribed its thirty-six dollars that they might send thirty-six words which should say to mankind that the Baptist conference of that county of Oregon proposed to have a Permanent Tribunal. I would tell the story, if I dared, of a little prayer which the chief ecclesiastical director of thousands of square miles of what you would call wilderness had instructed the clergy in his region to offer every Sunday, for the establishment of a Permanent Tribunal, and of how that prayer, sent to The Hague, won the assent of one wavering power. It was that sort of thing, multiplied by tens of thousands, which opened the minds of these hundred wise men of the world to the conviction that the nation which believes in the future, which is at work on the lines of the future, was determined that there should be a Permanent Tribunal.

The president of this meeting has told you very briefly that there came a culminating moment when our friend, Mr. White, the head of our delegation, who has been since his childhood almost a fanatic in his enthusiasm for Hugo Grotius, was able to invite the whole body of delegates to go to the old church where the body of Grotius lies. The government of the United States had enough feeling of love for that great advocate of peace among the nations to arrange that one of the silversmiths of Berlin should prepare an exquisite wreath, which now hangs above Grotius's tomb. The conference adjourned over the Fourth of July; they repaired to the cathedral, and listened to the eloquent discourse of Mr. White. I think Dr. Trueblood would agree with me when I say that from that moment there was no more hesitation. Petty details were swept out of sight, and the plan for a Permanent Tribunal was carried through.

The details of the plan are on exactly the lines proposed by the New York State Bar Association. The element which seems distinctively American in the plan is that which makes a Permanent Tribunal of magistrates who possibly will never see each other's faces. The Supreme Court of the State of New York consists of some seventy-two members who never come together; when a particular case is to be determined the proper number of judges come together and decide it. The High Court of Nations is exactly such a tribunal. It may consist of one hundred and four magistrates, named by the twenty-six states which have come into the treaty. We have appointed four,— Benjamin Harrison, Judge Gray, Mr. Griggs, the attorney-general, and Chief Justice Fuller; the English membership of the Court includes Lord Pauncefote; the French and German, the first jurists of those countries; and already — rather more than half the members being known to us — it is evident that the tribunal will be made up of the first international lawyers in the world.

The Dutch government is intrusted with the business of making the physical arrangements for the meeting of the Court, and for that purpose has bought a beautiful old palace in The Hague. The share which the United States has to pay for this is one thousand six hundred and forty dollars. This is the first money which, since the world began, has been paid for the setting up of the great confederacy of nations.

Matters have advanced so far that there are already fourteen cases ready for presentation to the Court. The one which it seems likely will be presented first is a case between Bulgaria and Moldavia, as to the ownership of a tract of land which has been made into an island by an incursion of the Danube River.

Thus we have made a beginning, the point of the wedge has entered. The institution has been established on which the pacification of the world depends. We have a right to expect that everything else will follow in due time and order.

Obligation of Women to Promote Peace.

BY MARY A. LIVERMORE.

A neighbor of mine was asked by the *Boston Herald* to prepare an article concerning the wars of the nineteenth century for publication in its New Year's issue. It was very carefully prepared; it gives a clear statement of fifty wars occurring within the century that has gone, and some of these were so long that, instead of fifty

years of war, the number of years in which there was some war in the world mounts up to almost a hundred.

This gave me a shock, an awakening. I had thought that the world was outgrowing its pugnacity, that men were becoming more averse to war, that moral sentiment was prevailing. I had always believed that the vast improvements in the enginery of war, by which all implements were made more deadly, would have a tendency to diminish wars. This does not seem to be exactly the case. Somehow no reforms go forward as we plan them. In our anti-slavery struggle the central thought always was that the moral sentiment against slavery was to grow until we should get rid of slavery peaceably. I have heard the progress of the reform prophesied by Joshua Giddings and Ben Wade and Cassius M. Clay, as well as by radical abolitionists like Garrison and Phillips; but I never heard one of them predict that the North and the South would become so hopelessly antagonistic that they would become embattled, that the continent would tremble under the tread of armies, and that at last the question of slavery would be settled by the President of the United States, who would emancipate the slaves as a military necessity. And it looks as if this great peace reform was also to eventuate in a manner unlike that which we have anticipated.

Every American woman, when she makes her first visit to Europe, receives a distinct shock from what she sees of the position of woman. It is horrible to see women building the roadbeds of railways, climbing to the tops of buildings to carry hods of mortar and brick, unloading freight cars at the railway stations, carrying great loads of hay in the fields. She does not understand it, until she finds that Europe has an army on a peace footing of five millions of men ; that a large proportion of them are withdrawn from productive industry in order that they may be trained to be better soldiers, that they have to be supported while they are in the camp and in the military schools; that it is not possible for them to support their families, and that the burdens of men are thus laid upon the women — dehumanizing them.

The moment you make a woman a beast of burden in the field you dewomanize her and make her a poorer wife and mother and member of society. Even in England, thirty women out of every hundred are unable to marry; the men are sent off into the colonies, to Canada, to Egypt, to South Africa; they live in garrisons, and they cannot take care of wives or families. A friend in London told me that she had trained her daughters with the understanding that they would probably never marry and must learn to be happy and useful as single women. But the natural instinct of woman is for a home, for wifehood and motherhood. Almost every one will agree with me in my statement that, when it can be happily arranged, married life is the best life for men and women both. Yet all over Europe the support of the army is a bar to marriage. In England I attended a Social Science congress, and it was astonishing to see how they dwelt upon this question of the women who cannot marry.

This depletion of the ranks of wifehood undoubtedly accounts in part for the great interest which the women of Europe take in the peace movement. There were present at The Hague during the international Peace Conference women like the Baroness von Suttner, whose book, "Lay Down Your Arms," has had an immense circulation, and who has herself organized a strong peace association in Austria. Then there was Madame Selenka of Munich, Miss Ellen Robinson of Liverpool and other women; while millions of women sent in petitions for the permanent tribunal, for the settlement of international disputes by a better means than the horrible arbitrament of war. Here in America the women did something. Among our many organizations of women is one, the International Council of Women, of which Mrs. May Wright Sewall of Indianapolis, a wonderfully able, courageous, scholarly woman, is the head. This International Council has for its constituency any national organization of women that will join it, and enough such bodies have become members so that it numbers almost four millions of women. This Council of Women signed, through the officers of each auxiliary association, a petition asking for this Permanent Court.

Again and again there has been an attempt to organize some great peace association among women. Mrs. Howe, years ago, started what she called the Mothers' Peace Association, which flourished for a little while. During the Civil War twenty thousand organizations of women, really peace societies, were auxiliary to the Sanitary Commission, and they did work, in caring for the sick and wounded, which was much more Christian than fighting. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has now in nearly every state in the Union a peace and arbitration department, all under the lead of Hannah J. Bailey of Maine, a Quaker woman of wealth, who is willing to spend her money in the interest of the peace reform. I wish all the women's clubs in the land would take up the question of peace and make it the great object of their existence. They have it in their power to do a great work in this direction.

It is very encouraging to hear what we have heard this morning of the Permanent Court. I am glad to know how far we have traveled and what a hopeful condition we are in to-day. I have no doubt that in the century on which we have just entered this cause of peace is to see larger victories than it has in the past. It is largely the creation of the nineteenth century; it has got an impetus; it has gained the ear of the public and the heart of some of the best people in the world, and it must go on.

In my older age I have come into a larger conception of God than I ever had before. I have come to believe so entirely in God, the author of every good thing, as to be certain that every good movement is ultimately to win. We see the little worthless thistle seed winged by nature so that it may be wafted to a place where it may propagate itself. And nature is but our term for God working through the physical world. Shall we believe that God cares more for this worthless seed than for great truths and principles? The Golden Rule is being defied by the nations which call themselves Christian, and Mark Twain has reason for his terrible satire when he represents the nineteenth century as saying to the twentieth, "I bring you the stately matron named Christendom, returning bedraggled, besmirched and dishonored from pirate raids in Kiao-Chou, Manchuria, South Africa and the Philippines, with her soul full of meanness, her pocket full of boodle, and her mouth full of pious hypocrisies. Give her soap and a towel, but hide the looking-glass." If we should speak

of the Christian nations as only civilized pagans, it would sound shocking, but it is a fact that they are mighty sinners, and engaged in work that gives the lie to the Golden Rule. They have made the name Christian nation a travesty and a fraud. Yet I believe that this is to be changed, through the mighty power that acts outside ourselves and works for righteousness and good. Will the great human heart be always indifferent and unresponsive to the great call of God our Father? A thousand times no! So we will not be discouraged though matters move slowly and at times seem against us, but will endeavor, as far as we can, to hold up the right standard, and call men and women equally to respond to it.

The Real Sign of Promise.

BY WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

Facing the new century, I have no impending millennium to predict. I distrust pictures of peace from artists in words colored all the more highly when war is at its worst. Anything that cultivates complacent inaction, because Duty, or Destiny, or Providence is alleged to be at the helm, deadens moral resistance and smooths the path of tyranny. The soothing strains from cheerful optimists have been frequent through the ages when freedom was imperiled, but not from lips of saints and martyrs.

Whittier rightly bade the discouraged reformer to

> "Clothe the waste with dreams of grain,
> And on midnight's sky of rain
> Paint the golden morrow."

It was useful and strengthening counsel. But when optimism is encouraged, not to cheer, but to overwhelm the reformer and shield the wrong, as is so frequent in these days, it takes on the aspect of an evil accomplice. The time demands, not pæans of triumph, but clarion calls for soldiers of the Cross. A nation with gory hands is out of place at a love-feast.

A cruel fact confronts us. We are entering the twentieth century after the birth of the Prince of Peace, while the millions of his professed disciples constituting the foremost nations of the earth are waging and defending bloody strife. The moralist can draw but a single conclusion. Either the doctrines of the deified Nazarene are valueless, or his worshipers lack the remotest comprehension of the truths he taught.

Generalizations are never absolutely accurate — always a margin of exceptions exists; but if we search the habitable globe to-day for superlative evidences of heathenism, for actions most in conflict with the rules laid down by Jesus, our glance rests upon governments wearing the title of Christian. We see Russia crushing out by force the nationality of Finland and steadily tightening its grasp on Manchuria. In Germany a mediæval monarch orders his armies, in the name of Christ, to devastate a foreign country in the spirit of revenge for justly resisted invasion,— a scene as horrible as the world has witnessed since it was first sent whirling into space. England, with piety on its tongue, is trying to crush out the life of one of the most stalwart races fitted to survive; one whose extermination would be a loss to mankind. Fortunately, in William Watson's words, "Nature, with the heart of man allied, is hard to overthrow." And "Time's last and noblest offspring," the United States, is busily murdering a distant people for their presumption in following the precepts and example set by Washington and Lincoln.

We look in vain for the protest of American organized Christianity against this repudiation of the Golden Rule. From the triumphant political majority of the nation comes emphatic endorsement of this betrayal of the Declaration of Independence. What a satire it is that the tersest and most telling truths should emanate from the pens and lips of professional humorists, the Dooleys and Mark Twains! Could anything more truly hold the mirror up to nature than Twain's pungent presentation of the nineteenth to the twentieth century? And how indelibly is our relationship to England preserved in his words "kin in sin"!

We know too well the defensive rejoinders. The critic is accused of magnifying the shades and omitting the lights of the picture. He is adjured to dwell upon the advances which civilization has made since the sun of the eighteenth century disappeared below the horizon; to think of the spread of education; and most of all of the increase of wealth and bodily comfort,— a progress which, conceded, makes all the more inexcusable the present swing toward barbarism.

It is difficult to accept such exhortation with composure. The morning papers bring to us the hideous details of the burning of an accused negro at the stake in the City of Leavenworth, Kansas, in the presence of eight thousand people. The scene was not in Dahomey or in Armenia, but in the prairie state wrested from slavery and dedicated to freedom and justice. And everywhere institutes of education and religion abound.

Is the end of education deftness in human destruction? Is it the rearing of children in health, learning and righteousness for the trade of killing? Is wealth desirable, won by the impoverishment of other nations or heaped up by the exploitation of the laboring masses at home? Is book learning more important than justice, or luxury than human rights?

> "Is the dollar only real? God and truth and right a dream?
> Weighed against your lying ledgers, must our manhood kick the beam?"

The first steps to reformation are consciousness of guilt and sincere repentance. No emphasis of a man's good qualities excuses his deliberate crime. They aggravate the situation, because, knowing better, he sins against the light. It is the same with nations. Therefore in saluting the new century, instead of indulging in visions of greatness and prosperity, it is fitting that we consider the true way to bring these blessings to pass. The future can spring only from the present, and we are responsible for the soil.

The conference at The Hague has been hailed in many quarters as a great step toward the abolition of war. This meeting is largely to celebrate it. With no desire to question the humanitarian impulse of the Czar in its inception, I take the liberty to doubt the sincerity of the participating nations and the leading representatives sent to the conclave. Military men, diplomatists, supporters of despotism, were among the foremost in the councils and debates. Not one protest against the infernal system that attempts to kill ideas with bullets found utterance in the congress. It was not a body representative of the people who were absent and forgotten, but of

governments steeped in militarism. Not the love of peace, but the fear of ominous financial burdens accumulating in all nations, was the underlying motive.

Let us rejoice that selfishness is often a spur to righteousness; but it is depressing to see so many true friends of peace resting with such complacency upon this hollow demonstration, the immediate prelude to three wars of plunder and aggression, involving the principal governments represented at The Hague. If arbitration is desired by any one of these great powers, it is chiefly as a peaceful method of dividing the spoils wrung from weaker peoples. It was impossible for Nicholas to select representatives of the Russian people or Kaiser Wilhelm of his German subjects. Had such been sent the whole system of governments built upon the suppression of individual rights would have trembled to its foundation. Wars are not made by peoples. They have no misunderstandings and need no courts of arbitration. It is the arbitrary rulers who seek to guard their own interests, and whose overthrow must come before the angel of peace shall spread her wings in any land.

We need to concentrate our efforts on the causes of war, not on the mitigation of its cruelties. Lessening the horrors only perpetuates the custom. The time is ripe to expose the system and to decry the soldier's trade. We cannot conceive of a practice too demoralizing, a brutality too beastly, a crime too infamous for war to cover. It violates every command of the Decalogue. It crushes man's spiritual nature and rouses the basest animal passions. No matter if waged in a just cause, its concomitants are ever the same. Yet, as Thackeray said:

"Your orthodox historian puts
In foremost rank the soldier thus,
The red-coat bully in his boots,
That hides the march of men from us.

"He puts them there in foremost rank,
You wonder at his cap of hair;
You hear his sabre's cursed clank,
His spurs are jingling everywhere.

"Go to! I hate him and his trade,
Who bade us so to cringe and bend,
And all God's peaceful people made
To such as him subservient?

"Tell me, what find we to admire
In epaulets and scarlet coats —
In men because they load and fire,
And know the art of cutting throats?"

More than a sentimental protest is needed. The military system should be made odious and a uniform should be a badge of degradation. Chivalry, which has a semblance of unselfishness and nobility, was made grotesque and ridiculous by pens mightier than the sword; dueling, which has the excuse of direct personal injury or insult, has been outlawed in the leading nations, and the law overtakes offenders. But regular armies have neither knightly impulse to prompt them nor personal grievances to avenge. They are composed of puppets who smother thought and become brainless machines of blind obedience. Everywhere and always they are dangers to civilization, the tools of tyrants and oligarchies. Educated to a false reverence for rulers, possessed by the illusion that one's native land is necessarily the best and greatest, the soldier makes a fetish of a flag, polluted though it be in evil service. The whole delusion needs to be dispelled by a revived Christianity and returning common-sense.

Tolstoy has struck the key-note. Down with the patriotism which goes for country right or wrong! Up with the flag of universal brotherhood that knows no difference of clime or race when liberty is in peril. Only where liberty is should the true man's country be. And when his own land is the betrayer of human rights, he cannot be too swift to censure and oppose it. Instead of applauding our regiments of schoolboys as they parade the streets, imbibing the spirit of violence in institutions that should teach abhorrence of war in every form, our protest should swell to thunderous tones against such prostitution of public education. Military drill in public schools means soon or late established militarism and the impoverishment of the people through taxes for armies and navies.

The strife of nations with each other springs from rottenness at home. First pure, then peaceable. The hopeful part of the situation is the manifest reaction taking place in the popular mind. The realization that we have become Spaniards in colonial practice is troubling many consciences. The decisive battle which is to settle the question of imperialism is to be fought in the United States and not in the Philippines. It will not be won by the subjugation of alien peoples, but through self-conversion influenced by material disaster. Nations can no more indulge in debauches and profligacy without pecuniary loss than individuals. On the heels of boastful prosperity the Nemesis of depression surely stalks. When the devil of greed is sick, the devil a saint would be.

The real sign of promise is the growing opposition in thoughtful minds to the settlement of international disputes by force. Though the present barbarous wars parallel in infamy the worst on record, there never were so many voices as now, here and abroad, crying out against the military idea. They will be heard louder as the martial spirit weakens and declines. Tolstoy, by divine right the leader of the forces for peace, from his Russian home preaches the gospel of love with a power only second to that of him who uttered the Beatitudes. In German accents from the Baroness von Suttner the world is besought to lay down its arms and suffer war no more. Renan, though dead, yet speaketh for the Gallic race. Against the cry of revenge for German wrongs we hear his earnest protest: "No vengeance! Perish France rather! Perish the idea of country! Higher still is the kingdom of Duty and Reason!"

And Anglo-Saxon voices are joining in the chorus. Where Bright and Cobden stood almost alone in Great Britain in denunciation of the Crimean War, incurring insult and obloquy, the English opponents of the Transvaal invasion have been many and unafraid, in spite of mobs and imputations of treason. In our own country when one compares the few outspoken protestants against the Mexican war with the volume of dissent and dissatisfaction at the conquest of the Philippines, he finds ground for encouragement and hope. By and by we shall outgrow the desire to lop off the leaves and twigs of the war system and shall strike at its roots with the axe of non-resistance. Then we shall no longer strain at the gnat of the canteen while swallowing the camel of militarism. War is the hotbed of drunkenness and

lust. Those who would make it respectable are its unconscious allies. It will duly fall by the weight of its own crimes. But before the spirit of peace can control Hague conferences it must dominate London, Berlin, New York and Paris.

Great century of possibilities, following the disappointing past with its crushed aspirations and noble dreams, grant that within your reign mankind shall cease to combat reason with slaughter, and that the bells of your closing may "Ring in a thousand years of peace."

The Present Position of the Peace Movement.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

Short views are nearly always deceptive. It is only the long view that gives any adequate conception of the progress of a cause involving the interests of all peoples and of many generations. Taking the long view, what do we find to be the present position of the arbitration and peace movement, and what the hope for the future?

If we imagine ourselves at the beginning of the last century, we shall find that, so far as any hope even for the organization of a peace movement was concerned, the world was a desert with no oasis in it. War was practically universal and unceasing. The campaigns of Napoleon gave Europe no peace for the first fifteen years of the century; at the close of the century, thirty years have passed without any war between the civilized and so-called Christian nations of western Europe.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there had been no cases of international arbitration worth mentioning; at the close of the century, there have been, as the last edition of Dr. Darby's book on "International Tribunals" shows, one hundred and ninety-five cases of international controversy settled by arbitration boards, and by commissions proceeding on the arbitration principle. During the first decade of the century there was no case of arbitration; during the second decade but one or two; during the third there were four cases; and the number has increased, until within the last decade (1890–1900) there were sixty-three cases of disputes between nations settled by arbitration.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was no peace association in existence, and so far as I can find no one had been thought of; there were individual peace men and women, but no organization. At the close of the century, there are ninety-one peace societies in the civilized nations of the world, with about three hundred and forty-seven groups under them, making in all four hundred and thirty-eight peace organizations. These peace societies have become united in a permanent bond of union, through the International Peace Bureau, in existence now for ten years, at the international city of Berne.

At the beginning of the century, no peace congress or conference had been held, or even thought of. At the close of the century, fourteen peace congresses have been held, five between the years 1843–1852 and nine between the years 1889–1900, the last and greatest of all being the magnificent gathering at the recent International Exposition in Paris. And not only have these international peace congresses been held, but also peace conferences like that at Lake Mohonk for the last six years, and national conferences in various countries of Europe. The peace congress or conference is now one of the standing phenomena of the time.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, no national legislature or parliament had ever considered or had introduced into it a resolution in favor of the principle of arbitration in international difficulties. At the close of the century, the national legislatures of the United States, of Great Britain, France, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Sweden and Norway, Denmark,— in fact, of nearly all the nations of western Europe as well as our own,— have passed resolutions, the more recent ones by unanimous vote, favoring the application of the principle of arbitration in the settlement of international difficulties. The first of these resolutions voted upon was introduced by Richard Cobden in 1849, and since that time the civilized world has practically placed itself on record by parliamentary vote as in favor of this method of settling difficulties.

At the beginning of the century, there was no organization for the study and development of international law. A few international jurists there were, but no international law association. At the close of the century, there has existed for about thirty years the Institute of International Law, a body of experts, year by year studying the nature and bearings of the principles of international law; and also the International Law Association, a body of experts and others whose aim is to improve and better formulate the system of international law.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century,— even at the middle of it,— no member of a national parliament had thought of entering into fellowship with members of other national parliaments to promote the cause of international good-understanding and peace. At the close of the century, the most important political association of men on the globe is the Inter-Parliamentary Peace Union, made up of members of different parliaments. It consists at the present time of fifteen hundred men, all members or ex-members of parliaments, constituting an arbitration group in the parliament of every civilized country. Even distinguished Russian statesmen — since Russia has no parliament — have been admitted as associate members of this body.

At the beginning of the century, the idea of international treaties of arbitration had not appeared; no one had suggested them. At its close one of the subjects most discussed in international relations is that of treaties for the settlement of controversies by arbitration, and the putting of arbitral clauses into other treaties. We have, at the close of the century, not only the Hague treaty, now ratified and in force, but between the Argentine Republic and Italy a treaty for the settlement by arbitration of all difficulties whatever which may arise between them. Many other countries are discussing the negotiation of such treaties.

At the beginning of the century, no arbitral clause had been put into treaties of commerce. Now, not less than twenty of the important commercial treaties negotiated in recent years have had inserted in them a clause providing that disputes arising under the treaty shall be referred to arbitration.

At the beginning of the century, he would have been set down as the wildest of dreamers who had predicted the setting up of a permanent court of arbitration within a hundred years. Yet within that hundred years we have an international court of arbitration actually established and ready for business. The dream of the supposed wildest of dreamers has actually come to pass.

At the beginning of the century, there was no peace literature, except the New Testament, a few fragments in the Church fathers and reformers, Kant's tractate on "Eternal Peace," William Penn's "Essay Toward the Peace of Europe," and one or two documents along the line of Penn's plan, one by the Abbé de St. Pierre in France, and one or two in England. At the close of the century, we have a body of peace literature so large that it would take not much less than fifty duodecimo pages to give merely the titles of the books and pamphlets written on the subject within fifty years. The three most remarkable books published within the last three years are Mr. Bloch's monumental work in six volumes on "The Future of War," Professor John Bassett Moore's "History of Arbitration" in six volumes, and the recent work of Mr. Novikow of Russia on "The Federation of Europe."

At the beginning of the century, war was almost universally considered great and glorious, and dueling was universal. I do not mean that everybody fought duels, but it was the thing to do in all countries when questions of honor were at stake. At the close of the century the duel is gone, or nearly so. We notice also, as the new century begins, two intimately associated and yet distinct moral phenomena. One is the large number of people in all civilized countries who protest against any war whatever,—a body of men and women who dare to lift their voices, not only against wars in which other nations are engaged, but even against wars in which their own country is involved. The other phenomenon, closely allied to this, is that every war has to defend itself against criticism by the open assumption that it is undertaken for the good of humanity. If it cannot, plausibly at least, make good this claim, it falls under the general condemnation of the public conscience. This is a change of the utmost significance.

I must not go on. I am, as you will see from this outline of the progress of the peace movement during the past century, an incurable optimist. The peace of the world is coming, certainly coming. It is not so far away as many think. I admit all the difficulties, all the obstacles and discouragements in the way. I recognize the iniquity and shamefulness of the deeds which are now being done in the world, of which Mr. Garrison spoke so appropriately to-day. None more so. I should have to be an optimist of the extremest type to have any heart at all under the circumstances. But I have no patience with that flimsy, lazy, complacent optimism which takes it for granted that everything is coming out well because the Lord Almighty is good, and yet does nothing to help root out the gigantic evil of war. I am for a wrestling, struggling, toiling, courageous optimism, that does not believe that evil of any kind has a right to exist on the face of the earth, and that takes hold of it with the purpose of getting it out of the way as quickly as possible, whether events seem to be moving in that direction or not. The progress toward universal peace already made has been made both by events and by men. Reforms do not go backward, they go forward. The past is to me an assurance for the future, in the matter of the peace of the world, because, under God, both events and men will, I firmly believe, continue to work for that divine event, still some way off, toward which at least our little part of the creation is steadily moving.

Hindrances to International Peace.

BY HERBERT WELSH.

Not only the glory, but the practical power of life, lies in its ideals. There are men who are disposed to ridicule the idealist; but let us for a moment consider the function of the true idealist.

What is the idealist? He is one who sees the true pattern of things as they should be, the one who is not content with the false conditions that exist. He asks that the true pattern shall be put into operation; that the thing that is wrong, the thing that is out of harmony with the true ideal, shall be made right. What could be more simple, more practical, than that?

In reference to morals, the one who sees a condition which is against the moral law and asks that that condition shall be changed, so that events shall move along the line of and not against that law — he is the idealist. He is the man who makes the world move forward, not simply rotate. As the idealist stands facing any difficulty, what does he ask regarding it? This single question: "Is this present condition right or wrong? Does it run along the line of the eternal moral law or against it?"

That is his question, and his only question. He is not concerned with the misleading inquiry, whether there are vast numbers of men who oppose him, whether the evil of which he complains is hoary with age, whether the passions and the greed of men are intrenched in it. He asks the simple question, Is it right or wrong? He believes in God; he believes in an eternal order of the universe. He also takes the historical view of things. He looks back and finds out one great thing, which the chairman has most powerfully presented, namely, the gradual evolution of moral ideas, of moral standards. He knows perfectly well that no triumph of right was ever won in a day or a night. History teaches him that great moral victories have been the result of long growth and of intense struggle. This knowledge makes him strong for the future. He is unmoved by considerations of the majority on the other side, and of the prejudices and passions that are burning to support the evil of which he complains. He is a rational optimist. He understands that the course of history, though it may have an ebb and flow in its tide, nevertheless, on the whole, has a forward movement. He remembers that slavery, like war, ran back into illimitable time; that it seemed to be everlastingly intrenched in men's passions and in their desire for gain; and yet he knows that, broadly speaking, in civilized countries slavery is dead to-day.

Men look at war. Because it is so old, because it seems so strong, and has such hosts of advocates and supporters, they are therefore disposed to lose all hope of its abolishment, though they realize what a gigantic curse it is. I maintain here to-night that this is not the

rational view. The man who thinks deeply and feels deeply reasons somewhat in this way: War is wrong; it is against civilization; the spirit of Christianity is absolutely opposed to it; it is a frightful curse to humanity; therefore, sooner or later, if there be an evolution of morals, if there be a progression of ideas, it is bound to go. The practical question is, Can we make it go a little quicker than it otherwise would have gone? That is the line of reasoning and feeling that every man will take who looks carefully into the question, and who is at the same time at all at home in moral work.

Let me try to make my thought a little clearer. For the last eighteen years I have been, with a small body of men, contending for the rights of the Indians. That is simply one little branch of the world's great moral struggle. But while engaged in that work certain principles have been made clear to my own mind. I have seen how a mere handful of men, protesting against an abuse, if they look into the facts of that abuse, and bring and steadily hold those facts before the public, can produce certain definite results with the absolute certainty of law. First, it was necessary to get hold of the facts. It was necessary to show that a wrong had been or was about to be committed. Next, in the belief that men would rather do right than wrong, that most men believe, theoretically at least, in that which is right, however they may be swayed at moments against it, it was necessary to present the facts to the general public. Appeal was made to conscience, to intelligence; and when there were not strong interests running the other way a good result followed, and sometimes even when there were. A volume of moral force from the American public was obtained which demanded that the thing asked for should be done, if the public had been convinced that the thing was right. The result has been that in most cases the demand has been effective and triumphant, and the wrong has been righted.

This bit of Indian reform history illustrates an important principle. It shows the logical outcome of the idealist's work when that idealist is practical. He sees the wrong. He does not say, "This wrong never can be righted because it is so strong," or "because there are thousands of men interested in maintaining it." He says, "It is wrong; it is running against the current of moral law and moral welfare." Then he presents his facts and asks that it be righted. So he gets his response from the public, and achieves his result. In other words, he has found that idealism is capable of producing practical results.

We look at war. We find that it brings out the lower passions of men. We know that when once men have engaged in it they become different creatures from what they were in the quiet paths of civilized society. We see greed of revenge, lust, indifference to suffering, all the things that the intelligent Christian man knows are wrong and against the moral order of things. We protest. But how shall we protest so that we may press forward the progress of peace steadily in the future and win greater victories than have been won in the past? That is an eminently practical question. We recognize that we have great obstacles to encounter; let us look at a few of them and see, if we may, how they can be met and overcome.

There is no country in which this work can be done with greater chance of success than in the United States, for various reasons. In the first place, we are a democracy. We have guaranteed to us by the Constitution the right of free speech, and we have maintained that right and will maintain it. We recognize the great truth which in the last two years we have fought for and brought forward more and more prominently, that we are the sovereigns of this country; that we have a right to decide how things shall be done; and that even the President of the United States, under our theory of government, is not our master, but our servant and representative. We honor his high office, and ever shall honor it, but for every act which he performs he is responsible to the people of the United States. He is responsible to the sovereign citizens. The sovereign citizens have the right and the solemn duty imposed upon them to say whether an act is right or wrong which is performed by the President. If they do this in the right spirit they will do it with all dignity, but with courage and determination.

This position of democracy gives us the grandest opportunities to confront the obstacles that are in the way of international peace, exceptional opportunities to meet them steadily and to overcome them. We can at any moment appeal to all the people of this country and lay before them the reasons upon which we base our appeal. In the last two years we have had much instructive material brought before us. We have seen two nations, in many respects the greatest of civilized nations, engaged in wars. We have been able to maintain a considerable body of people who have demanded the right of criticism upon those wars, and who have brought forward the reasons why they have thought those wars wrong, unnecessary and most uncivilized. Here, then, is the position of advantage which we have in such a country as this.

One of the great obstacles we have to confront is the false, or rather the narrow, rudimentary idea of what patriotism is. Many persons, when we criticise our own country, say we are unpatriotic; but we try to look upon this criticism philosophically. This notion of patriotism,— that we must support our country, right or wrong, no matter what injustice, injury, or disadvantage is wrought upon other countries, — is much as if a man should say that his family must be maintained and its ambitions promoted even at the expense of other families, or to their detriment or even degradation. We have reached, in social evolution, the stage where the plain truth is recognized that, in order to be true to itself, a family need not be hostile to any other family. It is possible, nay, a very simple and easy thing, for a man to do his whole duty to his own family and maintain their right, and yet to take the strongest practical interest in the welfare of all others in the social structure about him. If any one wanted to return to the old days of warring families, as in the Italian cities, it would seem to us absurd. We have outlived it; our social evolution has passed beyond it; but the advance has not yet reached the point where the same standard is applied to the nation.

This narrow idea of patriotism is our first great obstacle. But I believe we can show, if not now, at least in time, that our conception of patriotism is an infinitely larger,

truer and nobler one. The idea of patriotism now held by a comparatively small number of persons will in the years to come be held overwhelmingly. Our nation,—which we love and would die for if it were necessary,—to be true to itself, must do right; and just as the truest man will criticise his own brother if he violates the moral law, and show him that he has done wrong, so the true patriot cannot applaud or stand silent if he sees his country falling below her high standards. In the one case, there is a narrow and false conception of duty to country; in the other, the true conception. The true patriot does not hesitate, though the public may condemn him severely; if his country does wrong, then he is bound to protest and to warn. It is a fact full of hope, as our chairman has pointed out, that at the opening of the new century the number of persons who are willing so to criticise their country when she goes astray is largely increasing. This number will continue to increase, and so ultimately this great obstacle will be overcome. The people of the United States as a whole will yet confess, as many do now, that patriotism is not shown by mere slavish bowing down to the flag, but by demanding that their country shall be true to its highest ideals. This will have great effect in future crises. As the number of men and women increases who are willing to protest when the war-spirit is upon the people, so gradually will the power of self-restraint become dominant in the nation, as to-day it is dominant in the individual. Our standard has been higher in this respect than that of any other country; we have been less disposed to go into war, and are so to-day, notwithstanding the current at present against us. But the principles of our government demand that we should make the standard much higher.

There is another obstacle which can be overcome by rational treatment. What we want in moments of crisis is moral courage. During our recent unhappy experience, there have been thousands of persons who have not believed that what was being done was right, and yet have been unwilling to speak out their convictions. They have failed to appreciate the moral influence which men can exert by speaking the truth in moments of great crisis. I believe that in the future there will be a greater body of moral courage, which will lead men to speak out. The power of moral influence will be more and more recognized. Just in proportion as our citizens are taught what is this tremendous power of moral influence, and as they learn the full significance of this great peace question, then I believe, when the storm of war approaches, there will be developed a courage which will enable them to stand up and oppose it. They will not feel that they are merely insignificant members of a great mass and that they have no power, but that their responsibility and influence are very great.

There is another hindrance that we have to overcome. It is the power for evil of the public press. If our newspapers were guided by moral convictions, instead of swinging with a current which they know to be evil, they would have tremendous influence in preventing war. I know editors of papers who are saying things editorially which privately they deny. They do it because it is the "policy of the paper." What is the effect? A powerful influence is exerted through the country, frequently by the suppression of facts, so that thousands of people are kept in ignorance of the real condition of things. An English gentleman of distinction, who went out to South Africa during the war, told me this anecdote: Representatives of certain journals brought to the British censor the statement that the Boers were desecrating churches, and wished to have it sent by cable to England. The reply of the censor was, "I have not heard of this." They said, "But it is necessary to keep up the war spirit at home." "Then you mean to say it is a lie?" asked the censor. "Well, we do not care to characterize it by that term." The censor refused to allow the news to go by cable; but it was sent by mail, and was published in English papers. I believe that in the future there will be a steady evolution of righteousness on the part of the public press, and that in this way a tremendous pacific influence will by and by be exerted when questions of war arise.

Another hindrance is found in the false, or rather rudimentary, ethical ideas, which are expressed by the church in this country. It seems to me, after much study of the question, that a large number of our ministers hold their Christianity in compartments. Up to a certain point they are perfect Christians, as far as men can be; they do their work as well as it can be done, and they appear to understand what the teaching of Christ is; but from a lack of careful thought on international questions, when a war-cloud arises they are swept along like chaff before the wind. The fundamental Christian principles, which they applied so excellently in the narrower sphere, are discarded in the wider sphere. I remember an impressive moment last June at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, when Dr. Felix Adler, a Jew, made an impassioned appeal to Christian ministers not to abandon the ideals of Jesus Christ.

My friends, how will it be in the future? Will our ministers gradually feel this evolutionary movement, and will they, in much larger numbers than in the past, carry the standards and ideals of Jesus Christ into the international sphere? I must believe that they will. The truth will grow and prevail in the larger sphere just as it has in the narrower. I remember to have heard Colonel Waring, who died recently, say that when he was a boy he often discussed with other boys the question, "What would you do if you were challenged to fight a duel?" To-day no one is challenged to fight a duel, but the international duel remains; it will go, too, as just as immoral and irrational as the private duel.

These are some of the obstacles with which we must contend. It is our duty, in our efforts to remove them, first to form in our own minds, and as fast as possible in the minds of others, a clear and accurate ideal of what is right in international matters. As soon as we can get the idea of right put firmly into the category of national duty, then we shall have taken a long step ahead in the direction of peace.

This ideal should also govern education. There is an extraordinary opportunity in this direction before our schools and colleges. If we could have this record of what has been accomplished, as it was presented to us a moment ago by Dr. Trueblood, presented to our young men and women in educational institutions, there would be a tremendous movement forward toward peace.

My friends, this movement for international peace is one of slow growth; but the rapidity of the growth is directly dependent on the amount of intellectual and moral force which is exerted in its favor. The responsibility rests upon each one of us to advance that great idea which lies at the root of the Christian religion, the idea of love to one's brother. It is not a mere sentiment, as every one who has made use of it knows; it is a most powerful moral force. It is our duty to carry it beyond the family and the social relation, into the international sphere. What is meant when one says, "I love my brother as I love myself"? Simply that for that brother, whether he be a Filipino, an Indian, or a Negro, one desires the best that is possible for him; that one desires for him the opportunities which have made us strong, and which, if they be allowed the humblest member of humanity, can gradually lift him up and make him strong as well. Our duty is not only to create better methods than have been used in the past, but also to create new opportunities.

The greatest of idealists, two thousand years ago, gave us a great truth in the parable of the mustard seed, that in time would grow to be a great tree, spreading its branches in every direction. We must remember that the mission of Christ was not so much the setting forth of a new commandment or a new theory as it was the exhibition of new light and new power. All these years have passed, and that great force has not yet been fully employed. In the future it will be; it is our duty and opportunity to give it a wider field and a greater chance.

Christian Endeavor's War Against War.

BY JOHN WILLIS BAER.

The very first attempt ever made, so far as I know, to popularize the cause of arbitration among young people was suggested to Christian Endeavorers two years ago by Prof. Amos R. Wells; and as one evidence of how well the young people adopted Mr. Wells's plans, let me remind you that America's "Grand Old Man," Senator George F. Hoar, presented to Congress the Christian Endeavor Peace Memorial, which had enrolled upon it thousands of names gathered from every state and territory in this country, from Canada, and even from foreign lands.

Enthusiastically, and as practically, did Christian Endeavor arouse among its own members and others public sentiment which had been slumbering, and which when fully awakened will become an irresistible force. The topic of International Arbitration was considered and discussed in local societies and in conventions large and small, pastors were encouraged to preach upon the subject, representatives and senators were interviewed in their homes during the recess of Congress, and their desks snowed under by petitions when on duty. The important paragraph of the Christian Endeavor Memorial was the following:

"We wish to express our abhorrence of war, and our solemn conviction that it is the duty of every civilized nation to do all in its power toward making war impossible. We wish to record our desire for the speedy establishment of an International Tribunal of Arbitration. We wish to show our interest in the international conference to discuss this matter proposed by the Emperor of Russia, and to urge that our country act promptly upon the proposals of that conference. And especially we desire by our signatures to appeal for the immediate consideration of the question of arbitration between this nation and Great Britain, that the Anglo-Saxon race may become united in the interests of peace and goodwill."

From the opening day of Christian Endeavor's War against War until the day Senator Hoar presented the unique memorial to Congress, the campaign had the sympathy of leaders of thought in all walks of life. To show you how some of these men encouraged us, let me quote from a few, and only a sentence from each. Ex-Senator Edmunds said, "The Star of Bethlehem, and not the flag of war, is the true guidon of the world." Gen. Clement A. Evans wrote, "The enemy of mankind is war; the friend of mankind is peace." Ex-President Cleveland's cheer was, "The members and friends of the societies of Christian Endeavor have never entered upon an undertaking so practical and so noble as the effort they are now making to secure an abandonment of war as a means for the settlement of international difficulties." Ex-President Harrison sent this: "It is by a spirit of love and forbearance mastering the civil institutions and governments of the world that we shall approach universal peace and adopt arbitration methods of settling disputes." Bishop H. C. Potter said to us, "War is a relic of barbarism; and there is really no more reason that it should survive among Christians than that you and I should settle our differences by pounding each other with clubs"; and Mr. Stead's terse words were, "The armed peace of Europe is the most concrete and unmistakable negation of Christianity now extant in the civilized world."

Christian Endeavor believed, when projecting its memorial, that David Dudley Field's plan for an international tribunal should be secured before the Czar's for disarmament would ever be realized. The international court at The Hague has been established by eighteen or more powers; the next step is to make these same powers *use it* now that they have created it.

I shall never forget the scene upon Belle Isle, near Detroit, at the time of the International Christian Endeavor Convention in July, 1899. A great open-air demonstration was being held in the interests of peace and international arbitration. There were speakers from England, Ireland, Canada, Australia and the United States. The great throng was swayed by the eloquence and fervor of the speakers, who warmed to the theme of the occasion. In the midst of this great gathering President Clark read a cable greeting from Hon. Frederick W. Holls direct from The Hague, which announced that the committee to whom the matter of arbitration was submitted by the Peace Conference had proposed the establishment of a permanent international court of arbitration. This was the first official news of the plan received in this country, and was soon caught up by the Associated Press in Detroit and passed upon live wires throughout the country.

Good as its past record is, we have only begun to appreciate what Christian Endeavor can do in the coming days. Ours is a world-wide movement, international, interdenominational and interracial. It has world-wide sympathies and affiliations. It has a work to do not only in America, its birthplace, but in the remotest parts of the world. Particularly it has bound together the English-speaking youth in our four continents, America,

Europe, Africa and Australia. Christian Endeavor holds its great conventions on both sides of the seas. Could you have heard the lusty British cheers at our great convention in London last summer, whenever any one suggested that war between America and England forever be banished from the thoughts of all statesmen and others, you would understand how closely Christian Endeavor has knit together the hearts of millions of young people.

Permit me to remind you by this brief and hasty review of what Christian Endeavor has already done, and with this briefer reference to what it may do, that there is an increasing force here. Take courage and seek to guide and conserve it. Believe me, Christian Endeavor has no sympathy with the cry, lacking the spirit of economy and Christianity, "Millions for destruction, not an unnecessary cent for salvation." I believe I voice the sentiment of Christian Endeavorers when I quote in closing the oft-cited stanza from our Longfellow:

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts."

The Absurdities of Militarism.

BY ERNEST H. CROSBY.

The speakers who have preceded me have taken a more or less serious view of the matter of militarism. I want to devote the time allotted to me to the consideration of some of its absurdities.

Picture to yourselves, if you can, a village in which each householder spends the greater part of his time in fortifying his home. He keeps a keen lookout at the window, and every time he sees his next-door neighbor come in with a new blunderbuss, he rushes off to invest in another catapult for himself. Twice a day he drills his children and makes them shoot at a mark in the back yard, and all night long they carefully patrol the garden fence. Every cent that can be scraped together is spent on powder and dynamite, and most of the inhabitants in consequence are forced to go about half-fed and in rags. There is only one flourishing man in the place, and that is the gunsmith. Meanwhile, strange to say, these people never dare to fight each other, but act to their neighbors with the most punctilious politeness, bowing almost to the ground as they pass in the street, and addressing each other as if they were the best of friends, although their pockets are bulging with small artillery. For over twenty long years there has not been a fight in the place, except one insignificant row in a corner of the village in which two small boys were the belligerents.

Would not this be a good subject for an opera by Gilbert and Sullivan? Even in Kentucky such a comic piece would bring down the house. It is impossible, we all should say, that men could be such fools. Yet this is precisely the condition of armed Europe to-day. To this pass has the wisdom of rulers and diplomats brought the great powers of Christendom! Is this really history or is it opera bouffe?

But let us return to our village for a moment. One of the starving householders at last suggests, very modestly and tentatively, that it might be a good plan to have a conference to consider how they may spare themselves the necessity of spending every penny of income on bludgeons and shillalahs. The meeting is convened under safe-conducts in a room bristling with bayonets and smelling of powder. Each of the parties comes in toying with the hair trigger of the revolver in his hip-pocket, and the sound of drilling, of drum and fife, is borne in on the summer air. Can these gentlemen, thus coming together, look each other in the eye with a straight face? Ordinary, everyday people like you and me could not. But statesmen and diplomats, courtiers and generals, find nothing unusual in it. It is a part of their business. But it seems to me that if they had not been blinded by the atmosphere of make-believe in which they live, they would have shaken down the whole structure of militarism in a hearty fit of laughter, which would have been heard all round the world. Think of it! Generals and admirals played a conspicuous part at the Peace Conference. Fancy sending butchers to a congress in the interests of vegetarianism!

I do not want to belittle the Peace Conference; I quite agree with much that has been said in this hall to-day, and I believe the Conference will have lasting and good results. But there is an element of burlesque about it that I cannot get out of my mind. The curious thing about it is that this element of burlesque runs through all the armies and navies of the world. Take the best disciplined army of all — the German army. It is impossible to look at the great war-lord of Germany in any of his many uniforms without a smile. He has succeeded in making himself the supremely ridiculous warrior of the world. But it is not a personal matter. Absurdity runs down through the whole German army. The twirl of the moustache of the humblest Prussian subaltern has its share in the great imperial joke. Let us turn to the army of France. What shall we say of militarism in France? What can we say that the humors of the Dreyfus trial have not already said for us? I do not know whether you are acquainted with the best account of that famous comedy. It was given prophetically, some years ago, by the author of Alice in Wonderland. I am going to ask you to bear with me while I read a few paragraphs:

"There's more evidence to come yet, please your Majesty," said the White Rabbit, jumping up in a great hurry. "This paper has just been picked up."

"Who is it directed to?" said one of the jurymen.

"It's not directed at all," said the White Rabbit. "In fact, there's nothing written on the outside." He unfolded the paper as he spoke and added, "It isn't a letter after all; it's a set of verses.'

"Are they in the prisoner's handwriting?" asked another of the jurymen.

"No, they're not," said the White Rabbit; "and that's the queerest thing about it." (The jury all looked puzzled.)

"He must have imitated somebody else's hand," said the King. (The jury all brightened up again.)

"Please your Majesty," said the Knave, "I didn't write it and they can't prove I did; there's no name signed at the end."

"If you didn't sign it," said the King, "that only makes the matter worse. You must have meant some mischief, or else you'd have signed your name like an honest man."

There was a general clapping of hands at this; it was the first really clever thing the King had said that day.

"That *proves* his guilt," said the Queen.

Could any men, not reeking in the absurdities of militarism, have actually reproduced this delicious scene as the court-martial of Rennes did?

Now let us look at England for a moment. The humorous character of the military service is less noticeable in this case, because we are getting nearer home, and our own foibles are for the most part hidden from us. Who of you who has ever seen a gray-haired British general at a dinner party, in a red and gilt bob-tailed Eton jacket, has failed to see that incongruity which lies at the base of all humor? Can anything be more comical than the little round pill boxes which the English soldiers tie on the side of their heads, and which are supposed to be particularly smart? We are accustomed to think of the soldier's career as peculiarly manly; but how can this be reconciled with the petty jealousies which prevail in the royal army from the War Office and the Horse-Guards down — jealousies which are usually, rightly or wrongly, supposed to be effeminate and very far from manly? A British officer writes to the *London Times* from South Africa as follows (Nov. 20, 1900):

"These generals will, if given a free hand, continue to allow the commandoes to escape, unless each receives the credit of his capture. Reorganization is what we require, and men who will rise above these petty jealousies, and fight not for self glorification, but for their Queen and country. . . . Each general is a little king in his own estimation in the district allotted to him. But jealousy and selfishness prevent any combination, and times out of number the enemy has been permitted to get clear away solely on account of this ill feeling and idiotic jealousy and bitterness."

We sometimes — quite wrongly — consider such a spirit effeminate; it is certainly not manly; and it is a curious thing that it should be exhibited by the profession that considers itself especially manly.

And how is it with our officers at home? Have there been any petty jealousies among them? Have any two officers been stationed near each other during the past two or three years without indulging in cat-like amenities? From the feud between the head of the army and the adjutant-general on the one hand and that between the admirals at Santiago on the other, all the way through the service, there has been nothing but incrimination and recrimination. The army has been pitted against the navy, and each branch of the service has been divided against itself. I think you will bear me out in saying that the disputes have not been dignified, serious and weighty, in which a gentleman might honorably take part, but distinctly trivial and absurd. Why is it that the two military professions are especially the ones in which men make such an exhibition of themselves in public? I do not know any other profession in which men engage of which this is true. We all admire courage; but when a few hours' fighting is followed by as many years' quarreling over the results, our admiration is put severely to the test. I may add that the habit of rushing home from the field of battle to advertise one's own exploits in the magazines at a hundred dollars a page makes hero-worship a difficult job. I shall not dwell on the sad fatality which dooms naval heroes, old and young, to lose their laurels among the petticoats.

The truth is that the profession of the modern warrior is indeed a curious bundle of anomalies, with its torpedo-boats and torpedo-boat-destroyers, and its torpedo-boat-destroyer-destroyers; with its smokeless powder, and its artificial smoke to counteract the smokeless powder; with its barbarous enginery for mangling men, and its Red Cross for piecing them together again; with its indignation at such a crime as the destruction of the Maine, and its high honors for the wretched men who prostitute their talents to the invention of the infernal machines which produce such catastrophes; with its precious mysteries and secrets, its foreign military attachés specially licensed to find them out, and its assumption of horror when, as in the Dreyfus case, the attaché actually fulfils his only ostensible function; and, finally, with its proud claim to the monopoly of honor, and its readiness to obey anybody's order to do anything! Oh, for a little sense of humor in this all too solemn world of ours!

Do not misunderstand me. I do not wish to assail the character of any individual soldier or sailor. The officers whom I have known are almost without exception among the best fellows in the world. They are simply laboring under the popular delusion, for which we all are responsible, that it is a noble thing to deck yourself out in gold-lace and feathers, and wait for a sufficient pretext for killing somebody. I confess I have a little fellow-feeling for them, for I was once an amateur warrior in a small way. I served eight years in the National Guard of New York and attained the rank of major. I used to wear a cocked hat with an ostrich feather a yard long. I know what it is to prance up and down Fifth Avenue on a riding-school nag, feeling like a composite photograph of Washington and Napoleon; and I can testify, as far as I am concerned, that there is nothing but vanity at the bottom of the whole business.

A standing army could not be kept together a month without brass buttons and epaulets. All soldiering is a "playing at soldiers." Not a man takes it seriously. It is all a grand hurrah, until some fine morning the novice finds himself on the field of battle, where there is not one in a hundred but would give his ears to be safe at home again; while the hundredth man is temporarily insane, hypnotized into a "hero" by all the stage-machinery of a semi-savage histrionic and hysterical civilization. It is the feathers and tom-toms that do it. The man who beats the drum, to screw up the courage of himself and his fellow-soldiers, is but a short step in advance of the medicine man of Central Africa. We still display the head-feathers of the red Indian, and in the navy at least tattooing is still common, while the fondness for dressing up in bright colors with plenty of gilt is distinctly a relic of barbarous tastes.

Then think for a moment of the military custom of hanging medals and ribbons on your breast, which say, "I am brave," as clearly as the beggar's placard says, "I am blind." Other people get medals sometimes for life-saving or something of the kind, but they never think of wearing them. They hide them away in bureau drawers, and blush when they are questioned about them. It is only the military man who goes into society with a decoration on to say, "Look at me, I am a hero!" I have seen British officers with a string of ribbons on that ran across the chest from shoulder to shoulder. They are the civilized equivalent of the scalps that dangle at a savage's belt.

The committee which has been examining into the matter of hazing at West Point has been puzzled to understand why this childish custom should survive there so long after it has died out in other institutions of learning. Why should young men of twenty and more, at the Military Academy, still take pleasure in dosing

their juniors with red pepper and Tabasco sauce? The secret lies, I believe, in the silver buttons and rooster-tail-feathers which they are obliged to wear. A reversion to the infancy of the race in costume is sure to bring with it a reversion in spirit. There is a world of philosophy on this subject to be derived from a study of our national military anthem. I do not think we have ever paid half the attention it deserves to "Yankee Doodle." It is a patriotic duty we have neglected. The higher criticism ought to turn its attention to getting a correct version of this national hymn. I have asked several persons about it, and find their versions differ. Here is the best I can make out of it:

"Yankee Doodle came to town
Riding on a pony."

That was a very reasonable thing to do. So far we have no fault to find with the conduct of our hero. That was written a hundred and twenty years ago, before the invention of railways and trolley-cars; the carriage roads were not good, and it was a perfectly natural thing for a man to do to come to town on a pony. But let us go on with the story:

"He stuck a feather in his cap,
And called it macaroni."

You will remark that as soon as he ornamented himself with the feather, he began to act irrationally, and employ language which has no apparent meaning. This miniature epic is evidently an allegory. The feather represents the military uniform as its most conspicuous feature, and the moral shows the disastrous effect upon the intellect of donning soldier-clothes. But there is more than this in the song. Have you ever crossed the ocean on a German liner? They always have a great dinner on the last night and the band plays all the national airs, finishing up with "Yankee Doodle," and the Americans all say, "How much finer the other hymns are! Why have we nothing better?" The deep penetration of the author of the words and the composer of the music of "Yankee Doodle" is shown in the fact that they deliberately committed our nation to the comic view of militarism. Other nations take it seriously. Their hymns of war are grave, ponderous chants, from which the element of humor is rigidly excluded. It was left for the American poet to put the soldier in his true and comic light.

Cervantes has often been erroneously credited with bringing the age of chivalry to a close in a roar of laughter. This is of course a mistake. It was not chivalry, but the literature of chivalry, that Don Quixote ended. There is an opportunity to-day for a new Cervantes to perform a far greater exploit than has ever been ascribed to the Spanish author. A new Don Quixote might, nay, could, make the profession of war impossible by opening our eyes to the irresistible comicality of it. Mr. Dooley has done excellent work in this direction. Mark Twain has given some evidence of his insight into the truth. Will not one of these gentlemen, or some other genius yet to be discovered, turn his winged shafts squarely against war and the war-maker? When another Cervantes shall have decked out another soldier Don Quixote in his true colors,— when he shall have laid bare the childishness of the paint and tinsel that have so long held us under their spell,— then indeed the twentieth century will be able to boast of a greater star in literature than has as yet appeared, and bold indeed will be the "hero" who will thereafter select war as a career. Such a book would ring down the curtain upon the profession of the soldier.

The Commercial Aspects of War.

BY EDWARD ATKINSON.

I have been asked to say a few words on the commercial aspects of war. I have put these words upon paper in order to give the utmost force of which I am capable to every word by which the "hell of war" may be exposed, its horrible atrocities being only matched by its grotesque folly in the present age. I shall say nothing that can be deemed an imputation upon the members of the military and naval service, among whom I have many friends. I do not believe, however, in such deference to persons as may prevent the denunciation of wrong acts. I do not believe in crying "peace, peace," when there is no peace, but in taking the aggressive in maintaining human rights, so that we may force our opponents to close quarters. Admitting most fully that war has been one of the methods by which men have made progress, it seems to me that it is one of the unfit methods derived from brutes, which humanity has survived. Its advocates, on its alleged merits, may now be met with such ridicule and contempt as may shame them into ways of peace and righteousness. There are other persons in conspicuous positions, besides military and naval men, who advocate war, few of whom expose themselves to the dangers into which they entice others. The evil counsels of these should not be spared.

The promoters of war who present the "strenuous life" of the army and navy as one of merit, honor and credit in itself, often attempt to belittle their opponents by speaking of them as infected with the spirit of "mere commercialism," "seekers after gain, without broad sentiments either of piety or patriotism." Yet some of the most conspicuous of these advocates of the military life are themselves men whose opportunity for leisure and for such studies as have given to some of them what I call the nickname of "the scholar in politics," are men whose fortunes were attained by their ancestors in commerce. Again, the very atrocities which are now being committed by this country in the Philippine Islands, by Great Britain in South Africa, and by many nations in China, are justified by these same promoters of war, only for the reason that they are claimed to be means of extending the commerce which they pretend to treat with such contempt as an occupation.

True commerce rests upon mutual benefit and upon mutual service. It is of the domain of peace and order, upon which it rests for its true expansion. It is to the mutual profit of all who engage in it, both buyer and seller, both importer and exporter. That commerce which is enforced at the point of the bayonet and by the naval "commerce destroyers" is but rapine and plunder; it stands for gain secured at others' loss; it is unworthy the name of commerce; it is robbery, held in contempt by men of probity and integrity, who are the true leaders in commerce and industry.

Kant's vision of eternal peace through the force of true commerce is but deferred. I shall deal, however, only with one aspect of commerce as it proceeds on its way to the ultimate suppression of war. I shall speak only of the manner in which the evils of war — its dis-

honor, its fraud and its grotesque folly — are being brought into conspicuous notice by the force which commerce exerts in spite of the efforts of the military classes to retard its progress and to avert its influence. I call your attention to the development of the instruments of war by inventors and men of science: guns, smokeless powder, armored ships, submarine boats, and all the rest — made in great workshops and shipyards in which investments are made for purposes of profit, all of which are mere commercial enterprises.

The inventors of killing implements may never render war so dangerous as to stop it merely by making it more fatal to officers than to privates. Evils are not abated simply by material inventions or by physical forces. The moral forces and the moral energy of great communities must be aroused before the end can be fully attained. But even in arousing moral forces the inventors of killing implements have been most potent factors, because the necessary use of their implements has so altered the conduct of war. They have so changed the conditions which control the methods of modern warfare as to have deprived military men, even of the highest character when in command of armies, of their ability to carry on war without resort to every means that would disgrace the merchant, the banker or the man of affairs. The inventors of killing implements have compelled the great masters of the art of war to employ all the arts of deception: to spy, to mislead, to put falsehood into action, to ambush, to stab in the back, to get the advantage of having a better gun or a better engine or a better battleship, so as to deprive their opponents of any fair chance to resist; they are forced to burn, destroy and devastate; to turn women and children out of their homes; to violate churches and shrines, and to let their privates loot the plunder in which officers share. Yet in private life, in their relations each with the other in time of peace, these are men of the highest character.

Contrast modern methods with those of other days. In the days of chivalry the knight in armor met his opponent face to face in honorable contest. In the wars of the eighteenth century and in the greater part of the nineteenth, armies were arrayed within sight of each other; courage and endurance were the main factors, and at the push of pike or bayonet the struggle was decided by the man behind the gun—the great leaders truly leading, always supporting, and often, when the occasion demanded, being in the forefront of danger.

To what a pass have the inventors of killing implements brought these men of high repute! The battle flag can no longer be carried in the center of the regiment; no longer can the privates be rallied round the flag; no longer can the officer be distinguished either by his uniform, his epaulets or his sword, not even by keeping himself separate from the ranks of the privates, else he will be picked off by the trained sharp-shooter with a telescopic rifle discharged at so distant a point that it cannot be heard. In every great army there is now a special corps of these sharp-shooters who are instructed not to waste their powder on the privates, but to pick off the officers at every point of vantage. When there is no longer glory in warfare, and when to become an officer is to double, treble or quadruple the danger of suicide, the suppression of war by the force of commerce in killing implements will be near at hand. It will come by rendering the conduct of war so base in its methods as to shock the moral sense of civilized men.

You will remark that all the great inventions in killing-implements or engines have been made by civilians. The works have been established for purposes of profit, and it is through the competition of the great private naval constructors, makers of guns and of high explosives, that the military men have been forced to these base and barbarous methods in their use. A few minor inventions have been made by soldiers, but neither naval nor military officers have ever invented any engine of war of any considerable importance. On the contrary, they have been compelled against their will to adopt the inventions of civilians, to change all their tactics, to lay off all their trappings, to keep their swords in their scabbards and to put mud on their accoutrements in order to save their lives from the sharp-shooters on the other side who use smokeless powder and kill at so great a distance that the explosion cannot be heard.

Only within the month has the news come to us that the Queen's steam yacht, built by naval contractors, cannot be used because she has tipped over or will do so. This fact has raised great alarm lest some of the most costly British battleships should be as unstable. We may also recall the fact that the Monitor, which was so effective in our Civil War, was the invention of a civilian, built by commercial men and almost forced upon our naval officers. When a British naval officer tried to improve on Ericsson's invention, his ship went to the bottom, and he with it. God speed the day when we can put all our great battleships into "innocuous desuetude" at the bottom of the sea.

Men bred in the military or naval service, who have developed in themselves the capacity that might have led to great inventions even in the art of war, have as a rule soon left the service, taking higher and more useful positions in the arts of peace. The great inventors who have had the capacity to develop the arts of killing, and who have made such progress in recent years, have had the common sense to keep to their own vocation; their names are seldom or never found among the military classes whom they have compelled to use their weapons. Success to these inventors! It is to be hoped and may be expected that the Holland submarine boat, the Maxim boat, the French submarine boats, of the success of which we have had such a glowing account, may soon render every one of the great battleships that we now have in our navy and every one on which we are about to waste millions of money, nothing but a collection of old junk unfit for any useful purpose, even within the first decade of the present century. One of these great inventors in correspondence with myself the other day remarked upon this subject, that if it had been left to the military men to make their own inventions they would have been fighting to-day with stone axes and wooden clubs.

While the conduct of war has thus rendered it necessary for men of high character and standing, many of whom I know and respect, to do acts which would disgrace any man occupied in commerce, other features of modern warfare have become more and more vicious. Standing armies are of necessity nurseries of vice, especially when required for service in the tropics. The unspeakable shame of this country at the present time cannot be told in words. It has become necessary to

organize in Manila the only licensed brothel that exists within our domain, in order to protect the troops from the worst consequences of vice. Over that establishment the flag of the United States now floats in Manila, and none have the right to demand that it shall be taken down so long as that flag is an emblem of force now being exerted in order to deprive the people of the Philippine Islands of their liberty. This effort, including the license to vice, is sustained by men who call themselves preachers of the gospel of peace, by bishops of the Christian churches, so-called, and by men who hold the positions which statesmen only ought to occupy. They are using their influence to induce their parishioners and other young men, who might in the pursuit of commerce attain welfare and repute, to enlist in an occupation in which vice will be sure to overtake one-half at least. In India and Hong Kong over five hundred in each thousand are in hospital every year as the penalty for vice. Our experience will be that of England, where by methods devised by the Royal College of Surgeons an effort is made with very partial success to prevent the corruption of the blood of England by the fourteen thousand soldiers returned annually from service in the tropics of India and other British dependencies. Yet bishops and preachers who repeat the Lord's prayer, "Lead us not into temptation," daily or weekly, are themselves the tempters of the young men of their congregations and others whom they influence to enter upon this life of vice.

What could be more grotesque, more ludicrous, if it were not so horrible, than this travesty of Christianity which is invoked in support of "criminal aggression" and destructive warfare upon a people who are striving to maintain their own liberty?

"But," asks some one, "would you abolish armies and navies?" No, not so long as brutal nations exist who may emulate our present brutal course and who might attack us in order to deprive us of our own liberty, as we have made war without authority of law upon the people of the Philippine Islands. I would have a national police like that of Canada, thoroughly trained for defensive purposes, and I would have protectors of commerce in the naval service to police the seas, not the ships which we now own under the dishonorable name and for the disgraceful purpose of "commerce destroyers."

We are told that we ought to have a larger army than twenty-five thousand for home service and protection. Why? Is not the country almost denuded of regular troops, and has it not been so for over two years? Who misses the troops? Where are the few regiments we now have within our own limits? — who knows? who cares? whose sleep is less sound? What we need is to maintain our peaceful relations with other nations, to supply their wants, to remain as we are, in spite of our present waste in warfare, the lightest taxed country for national purposes among those called civilizedin the world; and by force of our competition in the pursuit of commerce to compel the states of Europe which remain subject to the blood tax of standing armies and war debts to yield to our supremacy in the arts of peace — that course will in truth make us the great World Power.

Our defense is in the service which we render in our commerce. None can dare attack this country by force without risking the destruction of their own industries, so many of which rest for the supply of their food, their fuel, their timber, their metals and their fibres upon us. Our defense is in our power to benefit rather than to destroy the nations whom we serve.

This is not the place or time to speak of the financial aspect of the war with Spain or of the warfare upon the people of the Philippine Islands. Our national taxes for five years ending June 30, 1902, as disclosed by the official figures to date and by the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, will have been increased forty per cent. above the normal standard established under the excellent administration of President Hayes, continued under President Arthur, and even diminished under President Cleveland in his first administration, to which standard they had been very nearly brought back in his second term.

In five years of war and warfare this forty per cent. excess of expenditure will have amounted to nine hundred million dollars. But our present taxes, some of which are annoying and petty, are not yet burdensome. What we shall have wasted in five years of war and warfare would have sufficed to pay nine-tenths of the interest-bearing debt now outstanding.

When we force the government to cease from warfare, as we soon shall, restoring our expenditures to the normal standard of peace, order and industry, we might well continue to collect the present revenue per capita, applying the surplus to the reduction of debt, signalizing the first decade of the twentieth century by becoming the first among nations that, having incurred a huge debt for the establishment of liberty throughout our domain, had paid that debt, principal and interest, almost within the term of one generation, by which it was incurred, and before the second generation had passed through a third of its allotted period. In this way the true spirit of commerce might be justified.

I cannot myself comprehend how men of high principle can now choose the profession of arms in this country, rendering themselves liable to take part in what General Lawton so truly stigmatized as "an accursed war." Many of them have been in the past and are now most earnest advocates of peace, even while deeming it their duty to obey orders in wars that are abhorrent to them. I hope the time is not far off when the profession of arms will fall into disrepute; when only police service will call for force. It is not yet so, and the present leaders or masters of the art of war retain their individual integrity and their personal love of truth. Witness the manner in which General McArthur has lately told the truth about the condition in the Philippine Islands; witness the stern integrity of General Anderson and General Greene, and the way in which many other officers of the army and navy have told the truth and shamed — whom? — the devil? No, they have shamed the so-called Peace Commissioners and the political partisans who have suppressed the truth and have issued during the political campaign the false reports which are now being exposed in respect to the conditions in the Philippines.

As surely as God reigns will the truth prevail and will this nation yet be redeemed from the disgrace and dishonor of its present course.

The Induration of War.

Among the hateful brood of the Philippine blunder, none is likely to bring with it more permanent mischief than this new militarism. Since the close of the civil strife there has been a marked recrudescence of the war temper. Our magazines have spread before the public, with inexhaustible reiteration, the events and characters of the war. The Grand Army has been in constant evidence. We have been shaking off the quiet ways and spiritual contentment of citizens, and taking on the childish emulation and sensuous display of a people who find too little in life to make it worth living. We want some one on whom to relieve the tension of our muscles, to take the prickling out of our blood. What does this stand for but the old story over again — at the one extreme of society unrestrained brutal impulses, at the other cold-blooded cynicism, with no sympathetic apprehension of the sufferings or the wants of the world? The induration of war strikes broad and deep and holds down the superior life under the ruling passions of the brute. Are we once more to take a direction whose wisdom is disproved by the entire rational rendering of the world? Militarism, in spite of its protestations, can never be a means to peace, for it is the universal law of life that like begets like. Violence cannot furnish an exit from violence. He who draws the sword shall perish by the sword.

TO THE DEAF.

A rich lady, cured of her Deafness and Noises in the Head by Dr. Nicholson's Artificial Ear Drums, gave $10,000 to his Institute, so that deaf people unable to procure the Ear Drums may have them free. Address No. 4971, The Nicholson Institute, 780 Eighth Avenue, New York, U.S.A.

A FINE GOLD PEN.

To any one who will send us the names of five *new* subscribers to the ADVOCATE OF PEACE with the money, five dollars, we will send as a present, postpaid, a fine three-dollar fountain pen.

The principles of patience and forbearance have long been accepted among self-respecting men. They are just as applicable between nations as between men. The man that goes armed challenges attack. The nation that goes armed occasions and suffers the chief alarms of the world.— *New York Evening Post.*

WE WILL SEND

The ADVOCATE OF PEACE for one year and this excellent

Marsh No. 5 Dictionary and Book Stand

(expressage not prepaid), to any *new subscriber* sending us

THREE DOLLARS

We use the stand in our office and can thoroughly recommend it.

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Farm, Field and Fireside, a first class weekly paper of the farm, price $1.00 per year, and the ADVOCATE OF PEACE sent to one address for $1.75.

The Angel of Peace

A FOUR PAGE MONTHLY PAPER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE.

ILLUSTRATED.

Devoted to Peace, Temperance, Good Morals, Good Manners.

Thoroughly Christian, but undenominational.

Bright, fresh and attractive, but free from over-exciting, sensational reading.

Just the thing for Bible Schools and Mission Work.

Price, 15 Cents a Year for Single Copies.

Five Copies to one address, 10 Cents Each.

Twenty-five or more Copies to one address, 8 Cents per Copy.

ADDRESS,

The Angel of Peace,
3 SOMERSET ST., BOSTON.

Why try to stick things with something that doesn't stick? Buy **MAJOR'S CEMENT;** you know it sticks. Nothing breaks away from it. Stick to **MAJOR'S CEMENT.** Buy once, you will buy forever. There is nothing as good; don't believe the substituter.

MAJOR'S RUBBER and MAJOR'S LEATHER.
Two separate cements—the best. Insist on having them.
ESTABLISHED 1876.
15 and 25 cents per bottle at all druggists.

MAJOR CEMENT CO., NEW YORK CITY.

50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS &C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Handbook on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.
Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive *special notice*, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, $3 a year; four months, $1. Sold by all newsdealers.

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, **New York**
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.

The

Fisk Teachers' Agencies

EVERETT O. FISK & CO., Proprietors.

Send to any of the following addresses for Agency Manual, FREE.

4 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
1505 Penn. Avenue, Washington, D. C.
25 King Street, W., Toronto, Can.
414 Century Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
533 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
420 Parrott Bldg., San Francisco, Cal.
525 Stimson Block, Los Angeles, Cal.

The Advocate of Peace,

A JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE MOVEMENT.

Subscribe for it now, and keep acquainted with the movement from the beginning of the Century.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

PRESIDENT :

HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, 6 Joy St., Boston, Mass.

TREASURER :

THOMAS H. RUSSELL, 27 State St., Boston, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY :

BENJ. F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D., 3 Somerset St., Boston, Mass.

AUDITOR :

DR. WILLIAM F. JARVIS, 233 Moody St., Waltham, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS :

Rev. Edw. Everett Hale, D.D., 39 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
George T. Angell, 19 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
Edward Atkinson, Brookline, Mass.
Joshua L. Baily, 1624 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Wm. E. Barton, D.D., Oak Park, Ill.
Ida Whipple Benham, Mystic, Conn.
Mrs. George W. Bingham, Derry, N. H.
Rev. Everett D. Burr, D.D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Hezekiah Butterworth, 28 Worcester St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Geo. D. Boardman, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Geo. N. Boardman, Pittsford, Vt.
Hon. Charles C. Bonney, Chicago, Ill.
Hon. Thomas B. Bryan, Chicago, Ill.
Hon. Wm. A. Butler, New York, N. Y.
Hon. Samuel B. Capen, 38 Greenough Ave., Boston, Mass.
Hon. Jonathan Chace, Providence, R. I.
Rev. Frank G. Clark, Plymouth, N. H.
Edward H. Clement, 434 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Joseph S. Cogswell, Ashburnham, Mass.
Rev. D. S. Coles, Wakefield, Mass.
Joseph Cook, 28 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Geo. Cromwell, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.
Mrs. Elizabeth Dow, Brookline, Mass.
Rev. Howard C. Dunham, Winthrop, Mass.
Rev. S. Hopkins Emery, D.D., Taunton, Mass.
Everett O. Fisk, 4 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
B. O. Flower, Brookline, Mass.
Hon. John B. Foster, Bangor, Me.
Philip C. Garrett, Philadelphia, Pa.
Merrill E. Gates, LL.D., Washington, D. C.
Hon. Thomas N. Hart, Boston, Mass.
Hon. John W. Hoyt, Washington, D. C.
Rev. W. G. Hubbard, Lansing, Mich.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, New York City, N. Y.
Hon. Sumner I. Kimball, Washington, D. C.
Bishop William Lawrence, Cambridge, Mass.
Mary A. Livermore, Melrose, Mass.
Edwin D. Mead, 30 Pinckney St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D.D., Springfield, Mass.
Hon. Nathan Matthews, Jr., 456 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
George Foster Peabody, 28 Monroe Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
L. H. Pillsbury, Derry, N. H.
Hon. J. H. Powell, Henderson, Ky.
Hon. Wm. L. Putnam, Portland, Me.
Thos. D. Robertson, Rockford, Ill.
Charles T. Russell, Jr., Cambridge, Mass.
Mrs. Mary Wright Sewall, Indianapolis, Ind.
Mrs. Ruth H. Spray, Salida, Col.
Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, Portland, Me.
David S. Taber, New York, N. Y.
Pres. C. F. Thwing, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio.
Bishop Henry W. Warren, Denver, Col.
Richard Wood, 1620 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.

DIRECTORS :

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Nathaniel T. Allen, West Newton, Mass.
Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D., Boston, Mass.
Hannah J. Bailey, Winthrop Centre, Me.
Rev. S. C. Bushnell, Arlington, Mass.
Leverett M. Chase, 16 Woodville St., Roxbury, Mass.
Rev. David H. Ela, D.D., Hudson, Mass.
Rev. Scott F. Hershey, Ph.D., Newtonville, Mass.
Julia Ward Howe, 241 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Augustine Jones, Providence, R. I.
Rev. B. F. Leavitt, Melrose Highlands, Mass.
Lucia Ames Mead, 30 Pinckney St., Boston, Mass.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph.D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Rev. Charles B. Smith, West Medford, Mass.
Frederick A. Smith, West Medford, Mass.
Rev. G. W. Stearns, Middleboro, Mass.
Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D., Brookline, Mass.
Kate Gannett Wells, 45 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Rev. A. E. Winship, 3 Somerset St., Boston, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Leverett M. Chase, 16 Woodville St., Roxbury, Mass.
Rev. S. F. Hershey, Ph. D., Munroe St., Boston, Mass.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph. D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Rev. Charles B. Smith, West Medford, Mass.

HONORARY COUNSEL:

Cephas Brainerd, New York, N.Y.
Hon. William A. Butler, New York, N.Y.
Moorfield Storey, Brookline, Mass.
Judge William L. Putnam, Portland, Me.
Hon. Josiah Quincy, Boston, Mass.

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be designated the "AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY."

ART. II. This Society, being founded on the principle that all war is contrary to the spirit of the gospel, shall have for its object to illustrate the inconsistency of war with Christianity, to show its baleful influence on all the great interests of mankind, and to devise means for insuring universal and permanent peace.

ART. III. Persons of every Christian denomination desirous of promoting peace on earth and goodwill towards men may become members of this Society.

ART. IV. Every annual subscriber of two dollars shall be a member of this Society.

ART. V. The payment of twenty dollars at one time shall constitute any person a Life-member.

ART. VI. The chairman of each corresponding committee, the officers and delegates of every auxiliary contributing to the funds of this Society, and every minister of the gospel who preaches once a year on the subject of peace, and takes up a collection in behalf of the cause, shall be entitled to the privileges of regular members.

ART. VII. All contributors shall be entitled within the year to one-half the amount of their contributions in the publications of the Society.

ART. VIII. The Officers of this Society shall be a President, Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer, an Auditor and a Board of Directors, consisting of not less than twenty members of the Society, including the President, Secretary and Treasurer, who shall be ex-officio members of the Board. All Officers shall hold their offices until their successors are appointed, and the Board of Directors shall have power to fill vacancies in any office of the Society. There shall be an Executive Committee of seven, consisting of the President, Secretary and five Directors to be chosen by the Board, which Committee shall, subject to the Board of Directors, have the entire control of the executive and financial affairs of the Society. Meetings of the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee may be called by the President, the Secretary, or two members of such body. The Society or the Board of Directors may invite persons of well-known legal ability to act as Honorary Counsel.

ART. IX. The Society shall hold an annual meeting at such time and place as the Board of Directors may appoint, to receive their own and the Treasurer's report, to choose officers, and transact such other business as may come before them.

ART. X. The object of this Society shall never be changed; but the Constitution may in other respects be altered, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, or of any ten members of the Society, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at any regular meeting.

Publications of the American Peace Society.

War Unnecessary and Unchristian.—By Augustine Jones, LL. B. New edition, 20 pages. 5 cts. each, $2.00 per hundred.

Dymond's Essay on War. — With an introduction by John Bright. Sent free on receipt of 5 cts. for postage.

The Nation's Responsibility for Peace.—By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. Price 5 cts., or $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

Nationalism and Internationalism, or Mankind One Body.— By George Dana Boardman, D.D., LL.D. New edition. Price 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

The Coming Reform — A Woman's Word. — By Mary Elizabeth Blake. New edition, 12 pages. $1.50 per hundred.

The Historic Development of the Peace Idea.— By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D. 32 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $2.50 per hundred.

War from the Christian Point of View.— By Ernest Howard Crosby. Address at the Episcopal Church Congress at Providence, R. I., November, 1900. 12 pages. $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

A Permanent Anglo-American Tribunal. — Address at the Washington Arbitration Conference, April 23, 1896. By Merrill E. Gates, LL.D., President Amherst College. 24 pages. Price 6 cts., or $2.50 per hundred, prepaid.

An Essay toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe.— By William Penn. First published in 1693. 24 pages, with cover. Price 6 cts., or $3.00 per hundred, prepaid.

A Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration. — By Edward Everett Hale, D.D. Price 5 cts. each; $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

Text of the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.— Price 5 cts. each.

Perpetual Peace. — By Immanuel Kant. Translated by Benjamin F. Trueblood. 53 pages. Price 20 cents, postpaid.

The Arbitrations of the United States. — By Professor John Bassett Moore. 32 pages. 5 cents each. $2.50 per hundred.

The War System; Its History, Tendency, and Character, in the Light of Civilization and Religion. — By Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D. New edition. Price 10 cts., prepaid.

The Boys' Brigade; Its Character and Tendencies. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. New edition. 8 pages. Price 75 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Topics for Essays and Discussions in Schools, Colleges, and Debating Societies, with a list of reference books. Sent on receipt of two cents for postage.

Report of the Chicago Peace Congress of 1893. — Price postpaid, cloth 75 cts.; paper, 50 cents.

Report of the Philadelphia Arbitration Conference, February 22, 1896. 83 pages. Paper. Price 15 cts., postpaid.

Report of the Washington Arbitration Conference, April 22 and 23, 1896. In May and June numbers of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE. The two numbers 25 cts., postpaid.

The Christian Attitude Toward War in the Light of Recent History.— By Alexander Mackennal, D. D. Address delivered at the International Congregational Council, Boston, September 22, 1899. Price $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

International Arbitration; Its Present Status and Prospects. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. New edition. 19 pages. Price 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

Military Drill in Schools. — By Rev. W. Evans Darby, LL.D. 8 pages. Price 2 cts., or $1.25 per hundred, postpaid.

The Old Testament on War. — By George Gillett. 24 pages. 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, prepaid.

Against the Teaching of War in History Text-Books. — By Josiah W. Leeds. One cent for postage.

The Growth of European Militarism. — Price 20 cents per hundred, prepaid.

William Penn's Holy Experiment in Civil Government. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. 24 pages with cover. 5 cts. each, or $2.00 per hundred, carriage paid.

The Social and Moral Aspects of War. — By Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D.D. Price, postpaid, 5 cents. $2.00 per hundred.

The Coming Day of Peace. — By Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D. 8 pages. $1.25 per hundred.

A Battle, as it appeared to an Eye-witness. — By Rev. R. B. Howard. Letter Leaflet No. 1. Price, postpaid, 20 cts. per hundred.

Hard Times. — Poem. By Ida Whipple Benham. Letter Leaflet No. 2. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Poor Harry, or the Terrible Exigencies of War. — Letter Leaflet No. 3. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

The Cherry Festival of Naumburg. — Letter Leaflet No. 4. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

The Logic of War. — By Katrina Trask. Letter Leaflet No. 5. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Woman and War. — By Ernest Howard Crosby. Letter Leaflet No. 6. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Coals of Fire. — By Willis R. Hotchkiss, of the Friends' African Industrial Mission. Letter Leaflet No. 7. Price 30 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

War from the Christian Point of View.— By Rev. L. Henry Schwab. Paper read at the Episcopal Church Congress, Providence, R. I., November, 1900. 16 pages. $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

Rem=Sho Typewriters

HAVE

Interchangeable Carriage,
Perfect Paper Feed,
Permanent Alignment,
Removable Platen,
Universal Keyboard,

and many other superior features.

Ten Days' Trial Without Charge.

THE REM-SHO TYPEWRITER.

Second-hand typewriters of all makes for rent, sale, or exchange, at lowest possible prices.

☞ We furnish business houses with operators familiar with all keyboards, making no charge for our services.

DUREN & KENDALL, General Agts.,

Telephone, 4385-2 Boston. **45 Arch Street, BOSTON.**

CONFIDENCE

A PERFECT PEN AT A POPULAR PRICE, AND THE BEST PEN AT ANY PRICE.

YOUR CHOICE OF THESE

$3.00

Laughlin Fountain Pens

FOR ONLY

$1.00

TRY IT A WEEK!

If not suited, we buy it back and offer you $1.10 for it. A Profitable Proposition any way you figure it. Don't miss this opportunity of a life time to secure the best pen made. Hard rubber reservoir holder in four simple parts. Finest quality diamond point 14k gold pen and the only positively perfect ink feeding device known to the science of fountain pen making.

A Suggestion.—An appropriate gift of never ending usefulness—for any occasion, insures a constant pleasing remembrance of the giver.

☞ Any desired flexibility in fine, medium or stub.

One Pen Only to One Address on this Offer

LOSS—on the pen you buy—Our SEED-TIME expense.

BUSINESS—Your pen procures—Our HARVEST.

By mail, postpaid, upon receipt of $1. If you desire pen sent by registered mail send 10 cents additional.

Reference:—Any Bank or Express Company in Detroit.

Address

LAUGHLIN MFG. CO.,
34 Laughlin Block,
DETROIT, MICH.

We guarantee the above offer.—

The Advocate of Peace.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS

FOR SALE BY THE

American Peace Society.

Prices Include Postage.

LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS. By The Baroness von Suttner. Authorized English translation by T. Holmes. New edition, cloth, 60 cts.

THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By Charles Sumner. Cloth, 50 cts.

SOUTHERN HEROES; OR THE FRIENDS IN WAR TIME. An account of the sufferings and loyalty of the Friends in the South during the Civil War. By Fernando G. Cartland. Third Edition. $1.50. Five copies to one address $5.00.

CHRISTIAN MARTYRDOM IN RUSSIA: An Account of the Persecutions of the Peace-loving Doukhobortsi. Price, 40 cts.

THE WAMPUM BELT; a Story of William Penn's "Great Treaty" with the Indians. By Hezekiah Butterworth. An admirable book for boys and girls. Cloth, $1.50, postpaid.

WAR AS IT IS. By Wilhelm Carlsen. Translated by P. H. Peckover. Forty-six illustrations. 45 cts.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION: ITS PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE. In French. By Michel Revon. Crowned by the Institute of France. 541 pages. $2.00.

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS: A collection of the various Schemes which have been proposed. By W. Evans Darby, LL.D. Cloth, 168 pages. Price, 75 cents, postpaid.

PAX MUNDI. A concise account of the Modern Peace Movement. By T. K. Arnoldson, of the Swedish Parliament. Translated by P. H. Peckover. 70 cts.

THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD. By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. A discussion of the grounds, both theoretic and historic, for believing in the Realization of the Brotherhood of Humanity, and the final Organization of the World into an International State. Second Edition. Cloth, 169 pages. Price, 75 cts.